

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME VII

New York, Saturday, July 29, 1916

Number 91

Contents

Editorial Notes.....	313
Leading Editorials	
Mexico Rediviva.....	316
Military Folly in New York.....	318
Father Blakely States the Issue.....	319
General Articles	
America to Europe, August, 1916.....	321
The Paris Program..... H. N. Brailsford	322
What Uncle Sam Does Not Do for Women in Industry	324
Creating Governmental Efficiency.....	
.....Frederick A. Cleveland	326
The Woman's Party..... Charles A. Beard	329
Any Stick Will Do to Beat a Dog..... Charles S. Brooks	331
Correspondence.....	332
Reviews of Books	
The Gallic Cock..... P. L. Rosenfeld	335
Curiosity Satisfied..... G. S.	336
The Right Kind of History..... H. J. L.	338

THE price of West Indian islands is going up. Some fifty years ago the American government considered it sufficient to offer \$7,500,000 for St. Thomas and the other Danish West Indies. The bargain was not consummated, but its failure did not turn upon financial considerations. In 1902 the price was \$5,000,000. To-day the administration, subject to the consent of Congress, is willing to pay \$25,000,000 for the same property, if property it be. It is an enormous sum, and the Senate may be no more willing to ratify the treaty than it was in 1867, but it will be unwise to refuse. The Danish West Indies are cheap at the price in spite of the fact that the increasing production of beet sugar has rendered the cane-sugar crop of the islands less valuable. What the United States would buy is protection against the possible occurrence of an ugly and costly international dispute. The \$25,000,000 would constitute the paid-up premium upon an insurance policy against one specific liability to war. Denmark wants to sell the islands, and under international law she has every right to convey her sovereignty to any other nation. But the American government would be certain to oppose the transfer

of the islands to a strong European naval power. In all probability the American people would be willing to fight in order to prevent the establishment of a strong naval base so near the Atlantic terminus of the Panama Canal. Thus the purchase of the islands will remove at once and forever not the least dangerous of the possible causes of quarrel between the United States and a foreign country.

AMERICAN public opinion should not, however, cherish any illusions as to the significance of an acquisition by the United States of the Danish West Indies. It is part of a project of imperialist expansion. It confirms the establishment by this country of a sphere of influence including all the territory and all the waters adjacent thereto between the United States and the Panama Canal. Within that sphere of influence American interest and policy are to determine the foreign relations of all the other states. It may even determine certain phases of their domestic affairs—whenever, that is, domestic disorders bring with them the danger of foreign interference. This particular corner of the world must be dominated by the United States, because the alternative military or naval domination by any strong European Power might be dangerous to American security. The domination brings with it a serious responsibility for the welfare of the peoples whose freedom of action is being impaired; and American liberals will have no duty more sacred than that of safeguarding these national wards against possible exploitation. But there is only one way of making it unnecessary for nations which possess effective physical power, to assume such international responsibilities. An international organization which could provide for the security of great nations could also provide against the exploitation of smaller ones. Americans who are opposed to imperial expansion should fight it, not by fighting projects of expansion, which can be justified as a matter of legitimate national interest, but by aiming to substitute for it an international organization which would seek security for

all peoples rather than for those only who are powerful.

THE very bad impression made by the British blacklist is due to apprehension of what might be called its reverberatory effects. Wednesday's newspapers carry assurances from Sir Cecil Spring-Rice that the blacklist is not intended as a secondary boycott, and that the blacklisted firms will not be stopped in their dealings with neutral countries. But as a matter of practice it is feared that the effect cannot be limited. There is a report for example that Dutch steamship lines are refusing to carry blacklisted goods. This is due to a general policy of commercial frightfulness which leaves the smaller neutrals at Britain's mercy. The terror is almost certain to be contagious, so that other firms dependent on the goodwill of the Allies will inevitably fear to deal with the blacklisted firms. While there may be no reason to question the technical right of a government to regulate its national trade, the actual fact of commercial interrelation in the modern world makes it impossible to define sharply the limits of such action. We are confronted with something larger than the legal privileges of a government.

SYMPATHY for the Allies must not distort American judgment of the blacklist. It is one thing, for example, to acquiesce in the "blockade" as a military measure. American opinion on the whole does acquiesce. But what it finds hard to understand is the military value attached to a measure which fights German commerce not within the German Empire. It is one thing to close up Germany so nothing can go in or out. That bears a direct relation to the outcome of the war, the freeing of Belgium and France. It is quite another matter to make war on German trade with neutrals in the United States, South America and China. To the American mind this looks like mere commercial aggression not for the objects of the war, but in the interests of British merchants. The real danger of the blacklist is that it is regarded as a measure growing out of the hateful policy of a war after the war. There is an internal struggle in England to-day between the protectionist Tories and the free-trade liberals, and the peace of the world depends on the victory of the liberals. Permit measures like the blacklist to pass unchallenged, and the appetite of the Tories will grow by what it feeds upon.

FRIENDS of Mexico ought not to delude themselves with the view that much turns on the course of the formal diplomatic negotiations pending between the United States and Mexico. Our

soldiers may remain on Mexican soil without necessarily threatening the integrity of Mexico; they may be withdrawn without necessarily removing the risk of aggression. What almost everything turns on is the rate of progress Carranza is making in the pacification of the northern Mexican states. So long as Villa, or the mere name of Villa, can raise formidable bands of outlaws, able to evade indefinitely the constitutionalist armies, we shall be forced to keep our National Guard regiments on the border. Conceivably this may mean a period of several years. Now, by no stretch of the imagination can a life of watchful waiting on the actual border be made to seem attractive. The citizen soldiers, scorched by the sun and whipped by the wind and dust, and eager, besides, to return to their civil employments, will feel very keenly the shortcomings of *mañana* as a principle of pacification. They are bound to prove prolific letter-writers, and effective propagandists for a Mexican policy that bears a really conclusive character.

IT may be a wholesome thing for Americans to lay the greatest possible stress upon the fact that among the forces that have tried to bring about intervention in Mexico are the base and greedy desires of grafters and exploiters. It is not a wholesome thing to make this factor appear sole or even paramount. There are a great many American interests in Mexico that are as unimpeachable in character as any property interests are likely to be, and their destruction through perennial disorder is something we have no right to view with equanimity. There are interests of subjects of European Powers whose destruction we must view with grave concern. Europe will not forever be too much occupied to turn its attention to Mexico. Furthermore, we can not be indifferent to the monstrous iniquities practised by bloodthirsty bandits upon the peaceable and helpless part of the Mexican population. Murder, mutilation, and robbery are not morally to be regarded as beyond the scope of our interest even if all parties concerned are Mexicans. It is possible that any attempt on our part to protect our legitimate interests in Mexico would make a bad matter worse. But this is not tantamount to a denial of the existence of such interests.

NO statesman or political group of Europe has made a pronouncement more auspicious for the future of nations than the recent declaration by the majority of Socialists in the French Chamber of Deputies—signed by 87 of the 106 Socialist members. They endorse appropriations for the continuance of the war, since they rely upon the statements of Mr. Asquith and Viscount Grey that the purpose of the war is to establish a just peace,

to be maintained by international contracts. But they demand that this purpose shall be stated in more explicit terms. They protest against anything that will support von Bethmann-Hollweg in "the false affirmation that the war had as its object at the beginning and will have as a consequence the destruction of the political liberty of Germany or the annihilation of its economic life. At this time it appears to all that in order to avoid a return of the barbarity unchained on Europe we must think of what already has been called 'the society of nations.' To that end it is necessary vigorously to oppose to those who know nothing but violent solutions our will to arrive at the rightful solutions, to which alone the coalesced forces of nations will bring the weight of their sanction."

SPECIFICALLY, the French Socialists fear the proposed economic union arranged at the conference of Paris. After stating that they favor reasonable measures of developing the production and exchange of goods among the Allies, they go on to say: "But our duty is not to reinforce a régime of extreme protectionism of which the working classes of all the countries would bear the cost, nor even to develop in regard to Germany a vital system of economic restriction that would be at the same time a source of certain future conflicts. . . . We will not accept a prolongation in an economic war of the disasters of the European war." The three Socialist members of the Cabinet could not, it is true, sign this statement, because as members of the government they had already become parties to the economic agreement. But their support of that agreement cannot be long-lived with a majority of their party against them. From the beginning of the war France has faced the facts, France has acted with a whole heart. Frenchmen of all convictions have been first among the citizens of the Allied countries to give their brains and their bodies unquestioningly to halt German aggression. It is still more to the glory of France that in her legislature has been expressed the first powerful and uncompromising opposition to the short-sighted injustice which now threatens the Allied cause from within.

THE breakdown of the settlement in the garment-workers' strike will be regretted by few save the manufacturers themselves. It would have healed none of the old antagonisms. It would have created new and doubtful embarrassments. If we deplore the violence by which that breakdown has been accompanied, it is yet necessary to realize how fully it is to be traced to the utter blindness of the employers to any social interest in their industry. It is true that the union would have kept

certain advantages. It would nominally have preserved the preferential shop. A more effective method for the selection of unionists was to have been devised. The agreement by the Manufacturers' Association to register all direct sub-contracting would, in the doubtful event of its being fully carried out, have marked a great step forward. Nothing was more subversive of industrial order than the old anarchy which left the unions helpless before the chaotic network of inter-relations between contractors and sub-contractors. The result of the suggested system of price determination by experts would in all probability have been a continuous series of small strikes destined only to irritate both sides. The right to discharge may have been, as Mr. Schlesinger argued, less formidable than it appeared. It may have been doubtful whether its restoration would have cast any greater burden than the old upon the union funds; for, under the old system, the delay in getting the Board of Arbitration to work almost always resulted in some two thousand men being out of employment. Arbitration, moreover, tended always to the production of discontent since the Board tried to evolve a series of principles by which each issue was to be judged instead of dealing *de novo* with the facts which arose. In these aspects, it is possible to see the benefits which the union leaders urged upon the strikers. And they were wholly right in the argument that the splendid manner of their struggle, the common suffering they finely endured, have contributed to the solidification of union sentiment.

THERE is, however, another and a darker side. The elimination of the Board of Arbitration largely destroyed the value of the protocol. It was a denial, forced by the Manufacturers' Association upon the union, of the principle that the public is interested in the methods of industrial organization. It was a fresh assertion of the impossible position that a manufacturer has an ownership which places the shop conditions entirely at his disposal. The Association could further claim that though they had granted an increase in wages, it had yet to be shown whether the new machinery for its enforcement would prove at all adequate; and we may be permitted to doubt whether the Association would have assisted the workers to secure it. The restoration of the right of discharge placed once more a dangerous weapon in the employers' hands. It is always easier to carry through a discharge than it is to organize a strike in protest. That right was the main weapon with which, before 1910, the employers prevented the growth of unionism in the industry. While they had pledged themselves afresh not to discharge any worker on account of his activity in the unions, we

know by hard experience how fatally easy it is to substitute complaints of inefficiency and insubordination for the real grounds of dismissal. We believe, in fact, that the unions would have had grave difficulty in retaining the preferential shop. The settlement would only have opened the way for a yet more serious conflict in the future.

WHAT above all emerges from the strike in its present stage is the splendid solidarity displayed by the workers. For three months they have faced the prospect of starvation with a grim determination that has not been surpassed in the history of American unionism. It has been a strike thus far without violence, and in this respect it was a notable advance on the situation of 1910. From the first the workers had public sympathy on their side; but it must be frankly said that public sympathy did not imply an equal public support. What is even more regrettable is the absence of any organized support from the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Gompers did, indeed, take part in one stage of the settlement proceedings; but beyond that official mark of recognition nothing decisive has been done. The American Federation will miss a great opportunity, unless it ranges its forces solidly behind the garment workers. It can now afford a convincing demonstration of labor unity which will influence the whole of American industry. Nothing will go further to show the manufacturers that on questions of principle labor knows no limit to industrial unity than such an attitude. Its failure will be evidence of an implicit sectionalism from which it is time the leaders of organized labor shook themselves free. An injury to one is an injury to all wherever the fundamental principles of unionism are concerned.

Mexico Rediviva

A FEW weeks ago Mexico and the United States were hesitating on the verge of an involuntary and depressing war. The calamity has finally been avoided, but it has not been avoided as the result of any attempt to settle or even frankly to consider the essential controversy between the two countries. During the heat of the crisis Secretary Lansing drew up an indictment of the behavior of the Carranzistas, which can fairly be described as one of the most formidable bills of grievances ever presented by one government to that of an ostensibly friendly and competent neighbor. That bill has not been paid. It has not even been acknowledged. In so far as the grievances were genuine they have lost none of their sting. What has occurred in the meantime

is merely a change in the attitude of the quarrelling non-combatants—a disposition on the part of each government to drop questions of prestige and to allow the other government to save its face. As a result of this exhibition of mutual goodwill, some kind of a border agreement may be patched up. Although the arrangement will not expressly provide for the withdrawal of the American troops now on Mexican soil, the troops will nevertheless be unobtrusively and steadily withdrawn. They will be retired without having accomplished the object of the invasion, but their retirement will not be ordered by the Mexican government or enforced by the Mexican army. As soon as the retirement becomes a fact American opinion will be placated by the explanation that the border has been rendered secure. Carranza will reap the glory of emancipating Mexican soil from the contamination of armed Americans and of an explicit or implicit tribute to the unimpaired integrity of Mexican sovereignty. The border will be rendered more secure than it was, but at a vastly increased cost to the American government.

The tribute to Mexican sovereignty will not, however, alter the facts. As Abraham Lincoln pointed out, you cannot fasten five legs on a sheep by calling a tail a leg, because even though you call a tail a leg it remains a tail. That an immediate collision has been averted and Mexican sensibilities soothed are desirable results, but results, however desirable, become much less desirable in case they have been accomplished at the expense of an express or an implicit lie. To perpetuate in still another document the fiction of Mexican sovereignty is to increase the ultimate difficulty of bringing about a satisfactory adjustment between Mexican susceptibilities and the facts of the Mexican foreign and domestic situation. Mexican sovereignty depends less upon verbal acknowledgment of its inviolacy by the American government than upon the ability of the Mexican nation to meet the necessities and responsibilities of its own life. It is impaired less by the unauthorized presence of American troops on Mexican soil than by the load of political and financial obligations which the revolution has imposed upon the national resources. If the Mexican nation were capable of meeting these obligations without default and without assistance, it would remain as independent as it was in 1908, but it has already defaulted, and if left to its own resources it will continue to default. Its own citizens are suffering from the defalcation more than are foreigners. Mexico requires American aid not for the recognition of Mexican sovereignty but for its restoration.

Mexico can, of course, legally vindicate its sovereignty by repudiating its obligations; but it

would be a still sorer sovereignty which would emerge after the repudiation. Intercourse with other nations is as necessary to Mexico as it is to any modern country. Its people need European and American markets, capital, and technical assistance. As long as they are unable to guarantee sufficient security to life and property, as long as they deny to aliens the ordinary guaranties under which modern business is necessarily conducted, they cannot expect to be recognized by another nation except as a kind of international defective; and the failure to inspire confidence and obtain foreign assistance would of course react on the nation's own self-respect. There can be no internal order in Mexico without goodwill and support from abroad. There can be no goodwill and support from abroad until a better prospect exists of internal stability and order. If she is to break out of this circle, Mexico like any other bankrupt will sooner or later have to submit some aspects of her national policy to a temporary external control. Only by submitting to such control can Mexico be saved from the consequences of still more disastrous disintegration.

American policy towards Mexico should be determined by a realization of this temporary Mexican inability to recover self-control. The aid needed by Mexico must, for many reasons, be rendered by the United States. Our own country has suffered more than any other from the consequences of Mexican anarchy. There has already occurred the loss of many millions of dollars and some hundreds of lives, the expenditure of many millions more by the American government, and the withdrawal of thousands of American citizens from their peaceful occupations. Americans are reconciled to a certain part of this loss; but it is not so easy to write off the losses suffered in Mexico by Europeans. They are an American as well as a Mexican liability. The United States cannot permit any European nation to interfere in Mexico; and this fact requires the American government to prevent the defalcation of Mexico from being unnecessarily costly and offensive to European nations. Thus, in so far as the liability of the Mexican government and nation are not owed to the American government and nation, they must be assumed by the American government and nation. The proximity of the two countries, the long frontier between them, their necessarily intimate social and commercial relations, and the overshadowing power of the United States must always constitute a controlling condition in Mexican national development. The United States occupies to Mexico substantially the same relation that the whole of continental Europe does to France. It is Mexico's only considerable neighbor; and it will

be forced to exercise the rights and to assume the responsibilities resulting from neighborhood.

Unfortunately, however, American policy is being determined more by a desire to avoid wounding Mexican, South American and American susceptibilities than by a recognition of Mexican needs and American ability to meet them. The President has realized, and has deserved the utmost credit for realizing, the limitations of justifiable intervention in Mexico. If he had adopted the policy so frequently advocated, of aggressively protecting American life and property, whether on Mexican or American soil, the results of his interference could only have been the establishment in Mexico of an imitator of Diaz. He would have been coming to the rescue of a system of exploitation against which the revolution was a destructive protest. But he has never sufficiently accepted the consequences of this attitude. Having assisted the revolutionists to destroy Huerta, he was all the more responsible for the substitution of a capable successor, and he will never obtain a capable successor to Huerta as long as he continues to celebrate in his speeches the "right of a people to do anything they please with their own country and their own government." The Carranza government, in spite of the loud protestations of its chief, is not the government of an independent state. Huerta could not have been destroyed without Mr. Wilson's assistance. Carranza survives chiefly as a consequence of American recognition, but he is morbidly suspicious of American interference. His attitude prevents American recognition from working its maximum benefits. It cannot be transformed from a formal legal tribute into active economic and political support. By insisting on a scrupulous regard by this country of a fictitious Mexican sovereignty, he is denying to his country the only available means of renewing its political and economic vitality. Patriotic as he undoubtedly is, his authority is being used chiefly for the purpose of preventing the American government from contributing to a work of restoration which cannot be accomplished without American aid.

If the foregoing analysis is correct, there is only one way of ultimately escaping armed intervention in Mexico by the American government. The Mexicans must be persuaded or must be forced to accept American financial assistance. The Mexican government cannot meet even its immediately pressing obligations without a loan. Carranza has been resorting to desperate and disastrous expedients merely to keep his government alive from day to day. The loan must come from abroad. Bankers cannot and will not furnish the money as a regular business transaction. Mexico has no credit and according to ordinary business standards

deserves none. The lending of the money would be determined by political considerations, and would have to be accompanied by sufficient guaranties that it would be spent for purposes of political reconstruction. But it takes a political organization to make a political loan—and to secure the necessary political guaranties. It is up to the American government. If it wants to avoid intervention in Mexico the administration has its work cut out in two directions. It needs to discover whether and upon what conditions Congress would make or underwrite a loan, and whether and under what conditions Mexico would accept the money. The difficulty of obtaining the consent of Congress to such a plan would be almost as great as the difficulty of obtaining the consent of Mexico, but they may not be insuperable. The mere threat of war has already cost a sum of money which if it could have been wisely spent in Mexico might make war unnecessary. The only safe way of avoiding war is to prevent it. The task of the administration is to work out some means of prevention. The obstacles are so great that it may well fail; but if the two countries are again allowed to drift into hostilities without the declaration by the United States of a positive policy towards Mexico and without some intelligent attempt to prevent war by going to her financial assistance the administration will suffer from an unenviable load of responsibility.

Military Folly in New York

OTHER states should take a warning from the example of New York in the matter of panic preparedness. At the end of a legislative session, without adequate public debate, by dark-room methods, a number of bills were slapped together, railroaded through, and signed by Governor Whitman. The bills provide for compulsory military service and training, that is to say, the authors think they do. In fact they provide for no service and no training and no preparedness. What they do provide is a demonstration of the futility of a state government, its political backwardness, its lack of principle, its love of sham.

One bill is known as the Slater law. It establishes a Military Training Commission composed of the Major-General commanding the National Guard ex-officio, a member appointed by the Board of Regents and one appointed by the governor. This commission shall recommend to the Board of Regents the establishment in schools "of habits, customs and methods best adapted to develop correct physical posture and bearing, mental and physical alertness, self-control, disciplined initia-

tive, sense of duty and the spirit of coöperation under leadership." If this means anything, it means something very vicious. The ideal set forth is simply an educational ideal, and if the schools do not realize it, a change is needed in school methods. The worst way to make the change is to set up another body of control, to divide the management of schools between two conflicting authorities. The idea of creating a separate organ for interference in school management is a cardinal sin against administrative efficiency. If the schools cannot achieve the ideal of manhood put forth by the Slater law, three commissioners getting in everybody's way will not help. The men who conceived this law and voted for it showed a total ignorance of what education is supposed to accomplish, accompanied by a total lack of administrative wisdom. For what in the name of sanity do they think we have schools for if not to develop "habits, customs . . . mental and physical alertness, . . . self-control, disciplined initiative" and the rest? What can a guerrilla commission of three accomplish that the schools are not fitted to accomplish?

Besides interfering with school administration this commission is required to prescribe military training for boys between sixteen and nineteen. This "training" is to aggregate not more than three hours a week under teachers, officers or enlisted men of the National Guard. A fine military education it is likely to be, conducted in assembly halls or back yards. What the boys will learn is how to parade, not how to be soldiers. The military education they can secure under conditions existing for most schools will have about as much relation to modern warfare as learning how to dance. Neither the legislature nor Governor Whitman seems to know that modern warfare is overwhelmingly a problem of engineering and mechanics and administration, and that thirty-six minutes a day of drill can contribute practically nothing to efficiency.

Besides the drill the Commission is to establish juvenile Plattsburgs in the summer holidays. The thoughtlessness of the bill is best revealed here. These camps are to be located on fair grounds, and \$100,000 is provided for them. Boys working for a living are exempted. It is a miserable class distinction to introduce into a public-school system, for it associates military affairs with leisure and means. It perpetuates the idea that military life is not the business of a wage earner. Then too, the \$100,000 provided will not begin to meet the requirements, and dangerous sanitary conditions and poor organization are certain to follow.

Then there is the Welsh law providing physical training for boys and girls from the ages of eight to sixteen. The "training" is to be prescribed as a result of conference between the Commission and

the Board of Regents. The Commission's power seems to be advisory. But what can such a commission conceivably advise for children eight years old, which expert physical educators cannot advise far better? What does a Major-General of the National Guard know about the hygiene of young children? What does he know about exercises which entitles him to interfere? Experience with Major-Generals supplies no hopeful answer.

The worst of this ill conceived, hasty legislation is that it discredits all rational preparedness. When men see politicians prescribing military training for children in New York after Germany and France have abandoned it, when they see them disregarding the opinions of educators from Dr. Eliot to Dr. Sargent, when they rush through mockeries of preparedness, men cease to be open-minded about the proposal to establish compulsory military service even in the form of militia draft as under the new Stivers law. Men who legislate and govern so badly are simply unfit to hold in their hands the enormous power of conscription. Their deeds speak for them. Their deeds condemn them as untrustworthy. The blood tax of conscription is the most serious instrument of government ever invented. How can a free people place that instrument in the hands of men like the New York politicians who have legislated to make a joke out of preparedness?

Father Blakely States the Issue

MANY people have found it difficult to understand why the question of child care in New York institutions should have raised such a tremendous ruction. They have said: Here are the institutions, the children, the payments by the city, and the obvious moral and legal right of the city government to see that the children are well cared for. Some investigators say that in some institutions conditions are bad. Why can't the facts be gone over, discussed, and the evils remedied? Is there any excuse for turning the question into a struggle between the city administration of New York and the hierarchy of the church?

The city investigators criticized twenty-six institutions. Of these twelve were Catholic, fourteen non-Catholic. By the non-Catholic organizations no considerable resistance was raised. Protestants and Jews, though some of their institutions were attacked, did not believe they were being persecuted. But Catholics prominent in charity work have regarded the whole matter as a direct attack on them, on devoted priests and nuns, and on God. They have fought Mayor Mitchel and Commissioner Kingsbury with great anger. Now, why? Why was it justifiable for a Catholic Mayor to criticize

Protestants and Jews, and the depth of infamy for him to criticize his co-religionists?

That is the problem in New York. Fortunately it is not necessary to guess for an answer. The "America Press" has just issued a sixty-eight-page pamphlet called "A Campaign of Calumny," which contains a number of pictures showing excellent conditions in certain institutions, and a great mass of argument and fact about the falsity of the charges and the glory of the real conduct of Catholic institutions. The sifting of the facts is a matter for official inquiry. The ordinary citizen cannot do more than insist that the inquiry be received as calmly by Catholics as by non-Catholics. What makes the pamphlet highly significant is the opening and the closing chapter written by Father Paul Blakely, Society of Jesus.

Father Blakely deserves cordial respect for the candor with which he states the issue as seen by the clerical organization.

. . . between the principles of Catholicism and the principles of modern sociology, upon which many unwary Catholics have looked with approval, there is an essential and irreconcilable antagonism.

He then goes on to explain the cause of this "irreconcilable antagonism":

How far this morality will differ from the morality proposed and defended since the days of Jesus Christ by the Catholic Church, is evidenced by the fact that, while the Church bases her teaching upon Divine Revelation, the modern sociologist finds his theoretical standard of morality in the 'highest good of the community.'

Father Blakely does not shrink from the consequences. His antagonism to what he calls modern sociology results in antagonism to public education as practised in the United States.

The Church is from God; modern sociology is not; for like the present day 'non-sectarian' education it has severed all relations with him.

He closes with an appeal for money.

But, measured in legal tender, how much is your undoubted sympathy for the calumniated Catholic institutions worth? The destiny of immortal souls, for whom Christ died, may hang on your answer.

We gladly accept the issue as Father Blakely states it. What has brought this situation to a head in New York is beyond all doubt the conflict between clerical and secular tradition. The old warfare between church and state, between theology and science, underlies the struggle in New York. It is the struggle which France fought recently and won, leaving the Papacy anti-French in the war. It is the struggle so poignant in Massachusetts. It is a struggle which distracts the world of education, a struggle which most people observe, and few discuss. Father Blakely gives the real reason why the

hierarchy resents public criticism. He has put his finger on the reason why Catholics have resented bitterly what non-Catholics took as a matter of course. The reason is that lay control of education and philanthropy is opposed by the political tradition of the Church, and Mayor Mitchel's attempt to regulate private institutions taking public money was treated at once by Catholic leaders as a war of church and state. The enemy, as Father Blakely so plainly says, is the secularizing tendency of modern life. The church has never accepted the American public school. It has fought it with the parochial school, it has never acquiesced in the taxation of Catholics for lay education, and it has persistently tried to secure a political control of school boards. From a like motive it now resists Mayor Mitchel as one who would take God out of the hearts of little children. From its own point of view the church is perfectly right in its antagonism, however unwise the tactics it pursues. The secularization of philanthropy is one of the clear intentions of modern liberals, and though liberals wish to proceed moderately and with all possible fairness they do intend to proceed.

They have begun merely with an attempt to enforce the law and to secure minimum standards of sanitation and treatment. Catholics like Father Blakely know, however, that this is merely the entering wedge in a greater movement to extend public control over education and philanthropy. They know that modern social science does not look favorably upon institutional life for normal children. They know that reformers plan to withdraw dependent children who are not defective from institutions and put them into homes where the child can have the advantage of family life and a less mechanical care. Knowing all this, they fight at the drop of the hat, fight even inspection to do away with vermin and bad ventilation and darkness. They fight for the right of the church to mould the child to its own ideals and for the perpetuation of the great vested interest of private institutions.

What Father Blakely calls "modern sociology" is really the beginning of an effort to formulate democracy as a positive ideal. The older theories of democracy were negative, built up to protest against kings, aristocracies, and oppression. Those theories were concerned chiefly in saying what government must not do. But during the nineteenth century popular rule became increasingly a reality, and people came to feel that government is not an alien thing to be limited, but a social instrument to be used. Democracy has been evolving from a protest into a purpose. It is becoming a philosophy of life, no longer protestant but in its own way catholic. To be a democrat to-day is to be something more than a voter. It is to believe in a scale

of human values, to have a morality and to think with certain assumptions. "Modern sociologists" are simply men engaged in stating the affirmative faith of democracy.

This has brought about a change in the meaning of tolerance. The older view of eighteenth-century liberalism was that the democratic state must allow every one freedom to practise almost any creed, even though the creed was opposed to freedom. It thought of democracy as a vacuum in which all might compete for place. But twentieth-century democracy believes that the community has certain positive ends to achieve, and if they are to be achieved the community must control the education of the young. It believes that training in scientific habits of mind is fundamental to the progress of democracy. It believes that freedom and tolerance mean the development of independent powers of judgment in the young, not the freedom of older people to impose their dogmas on the young. Democracy claims no right to interfere with worship or opinion, but it does claim the right to develop in every child the capacity for testing its own convictions. It insists that the plasticity of the child shall not be artificially and prematurely hardened into a philosophy of life, but that experimental naturalistic aptitudes shall constitute the true education.

It is this demand of democracy which Father Blakely has in mind when he says that more money should be given to Catholic institutions because "the destiny of immortal souls" may hang upon the endowment. The candid democrat must reply to him that no one has a monopoly in salvation, that there may be other destinies besides those conceived by Father Blakely, and that the power to choose and control destiny is the ambition of democrats educated in an age of science.

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1916, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL
WALTER E. WEYL

WALTER LIPPMANN
FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN S. JOHNSON

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

America to Europe, August, 1916

AS the war goes into a third year the minds of Europe are beginning to turn towards the settlement. In Germany the desire for peace is no longer concealed. It is possible to predict with confidence that among the Allies the submerged longing for an end of the agony will burst forth as soon as the present offensive on all fronts has come to some kind of conclusion. Whether the result is success or failure or indecision, a new impulse to negotiate will almost certainly appear.

Just now the most useful service of American opinion would be to give people in Europe a working knowledge of what to expect of the United States. Hotheads in all the warring countries have insisted that America will not count, either because it has stood aloof or because it has been unneutral. But the more sensible men know that America is bound to count merely because of its immense bulk and latent power. They know that the schism of Europe is too deep for any lasting adjustment by the Peace Congress unless the semi-detached influence of America is brought in to guarantee stability. Europe will remain on a predatory basis if it is divided into two well matched alliances. Only the intervention of the neutral world can give power to the liberals in all countries and make a just peace possible and durable.

If the settlement is made by the belligerents alone, instead of by a council of nations, a disastrous peace is almost sure to be constructed. Assuming, for example, that Grey represents liberal England and von Bethmann-Hollweg moderate Germany, if these men meet they will feel behind them constantly the dangerous pressure of the von Reventlows and the Northcliffes, the Pan-Germans and the "ginger" groups, the forces of jingoism and wrath. The extremists on both sides have a tremendous appeal to their people when they say that no faith can be put in the enemy. But if the neutrals under the leadership of the United States will guarantee by force the terms of the settlement some hope exists of an arrangement in the interests of peace rather than as a measure of relative power. The attitude of the United States may prove to be crucial, and it is of the utmost importance that Europe should form accurate expectations about the United States.

America's action is contingent upon European policy. That is to say, the amount of responsibility America can be made to assume will depend on America's judgment of the good faith, the liberalism and the ambitions of the major belligerents. It is a tremendous task to arouse the United States

from its isolation, and it will not be achieved unless the American people can be convinced that they are exchanging their historic policy for a policy of greater promise.

Were Germany triumphant, able to annex new territory and to terrorize Europe, the United States would remain aloof, and would merely arm heavily. But at present no such result seems possible. To dominant American opinion the exhaustion of Germany is a matter of time and the price the Allies are willing to pay. The really important consideration to-day is this: How will the Allies use their victory? On that depends America's attitude towards Europe.

To Englishmen especially we feel that we have a right to speak frankly, and to tell them what we fear. They must not be deceived by the attitude of Americans living in England, or by upper-class feeling in the big cities of the United States. There is a school of American opinion which is more pro-Ally than the Allies, as full of futile hate against Germany as the *Morning Post* or the *National Review*. There are Americans who have always looked upon the British Tory as the apex of the social pyramid. But though noisy and prominent they are utterly unrepresentative, and their political power in a matter like this is very small. Two other factions in our population need to be considered, the organized Irish and Germans. The Dublin executions have done more to drive America back to isolation than any other event since the war began. It will be a long time before official America will be able to come to open agreement with any alliance of which Britain is the dominant partner. As for the Americans of German descent, their pro-Germanism has been a good deal exaggerated because of the action of leaders whom they have not repudiated. In our judgment they would not prove an insuperable obstacle to American participation in European affairs, provided that the status quo America was called upon to guarantee were not vindictive to Germany.

The great mass of American opinion can be won only by proof that Europe is dominated by liberals. An arrangement with Tories and chauvinists and imperialists is unthinkable, and Americans are watching with some misgiving the internal politics of Britain and Germany. They would take no responsibility for the peace of Europe if policy is to be dictated by men like Carson, Northcliffe and Curzon. The news which has come to us in the last few months has been a serious setback to the propaganda for an abandonment of isolation. Among

the most important items of such news are these:

The proposal for a war after the war by means of tariffs, boycotts, and what not. If this is attempted it will drive us into isolation. If successful, it will ultimately push us into the arms of Germany.

The muddle of Ireland, which has made America question the liberalism of Britain and the sincerity of her talk about small nationalities or the good faith of her interest in Poles, Danes, and Alsatians.

The activity of Japan and Russia in China.

The publication of a blacklist. This is regarded by most Americans as a disruption of the world's commerce, not as a military measure against Germany. With Germany and all the adjoining neutrals blockaded, America sees no sense in the measure, and regards it as an attempt to destroy Ger-

many, not as an effort to conquer her military power. It is regarded by Americans as insulting and as an invasion of their rights.

We do not believe that these measures represent the will of liberal England. They represent the reaction of wartime. But they have done and are doing infinite harm to any effort which might induce America to guarantee the settlement. We had got along pretty far in our willingness to join. President Wilson has made a speech which in its significance outweighs any statement of foreign policy made since the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed. But the realization of this promise hangs on the victory of liberalism in Europe and especially in England. In its bearing upon the future the war of parties within the nations may be more significant now than the war of the nations.

The Paris Program

THE tendency of the human mind to work in closed compartments is never so manifest as in the heightened emotional tension of wartime. Two statements might be ventured about mass-opinion in the Allied countries at this moment. In the first place there is no weakening of the hatred of militarism which was our dominant mood when the war broke out. With all our patience under the duration and cost of this war, there is still active in the inner mind even of the less idealistic among us an aspiration and belief that this war must make an end of the domination of force. In spite of some dread among our conservatives which found a tactless expression in the *Times*, that President Wilson may want to mediate before our slowly gathered forces have achieved the maximum, the conception of a League to Enforce Peace answers to some vague hope in our own national consciousness. One might indeed go farther. There is even a somewhat helpless instinct which one may detect, especially in Liberal comments, that when the Old World has finished its riot of destruction, the United States must step down, like the god in the car at the end of a Euripidean drama, to point the blood-stained heroes to the altars of conciliation and the judgment of an Areopagus. Viscount Grey, in his almost passionate proclamation of the ideal of "conference" as the means of settling the common affairs of Europe, spoke in his Chicago interview for all that is still sane in British public opinion. This mood is compatible with an uneasy sense that "preparedness" on a greater scale than ever, and even permanent compulsory service may be necessary after the war. There is no actual inconsistency

there, but only a weakness of faith. The inconsistency begins when one turns to the second statement which might be made with as little risk of contradiction.

Side by side with the rather vague hope that Mr. Wilson will help us to set up some species of world council for the avoidance of future war, there is the determination voiced by the resolutions of the Paris Conference to exclude our present enemies, by every means in our power, from the markets of the world, from intercourse with ourselves, and from access to the natural resources of the territories which we control. This is certainly not a resolve so unanimous as the other. But the opposition is intimidated and weak. The Liberal newspapers in England have all entered a quiet protest against it, but with the exception of the *Nation* they are not as yet campaigning against it. The average steady free-trader is so startled by the wildness of these Paris proposals that he finds a difficulty in treating them seriously. He knows that the masses are for the moment against him, and his tactics are to "lie low" until the cool mood of peace enables him to conduct his argument under more favorable political conditions.

There probably is, especially in the sober north of England, a large population which sees the folly of this incendiary program. But in the House of Commons the Unionist party would undoubtedly secure from the more capitalistic Liberals and the less steady of the Labor members reinforcements enough to carry the Paris program by a substantial majority vote. Mr. Bonar Law has been permitted to announce that the Cabinet supports them, and

it is evident that Mr. Asquith is no more disposed to make a fight on the principle of free trade than on the principle of voluntary service. He will procrastinate and minimize, and eventually for the sake of unity he will give the protectionists all they demand, under the guise of temporary emergency measure. For this policy he will have one excuse, which the machine politician will think sufficient: if he were to resist Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Lloyd George openly, he would be forced to a general election, in which the policy of boycott would unquestionably win.

Deserted by their leaders, all but a few of the more idealistic free-traders, backed by some of the powerful industries which stand to lose by the change, will give up the fight and adjust themselves to a world transformed by war. Some will intend to renew the fight five or ten years after the peace, forgetting that after a period of drastic protection industry will have adjusted itself to the new conditions. A subtler school of thought "lies low" because it sees in the boycott proposals only a bluffing move in the diplomatic game. The boycott is in this view an expedient, like the blockade, for bringing the enemy to terms. When the settlement comes, we shall make him pay for its removal. I question, for my part, whether that is a safe calculation. It may represent the secret hope of the free-traders in the British government. But Mr. Bonar Law and his friends undoubtedly mean business. The French by all accounts are even more determined, and we shall not risk, even for our trade, a breach in the Entente. The question whether the Allies will maintain a really drastic boycott in the spirit of the Paris resolutions depends, if no outside factor should intervene, on the military situation when peace is negotiated. If the "war map" is still substantially what it is to-day, if Austria can be rescued for the second time, and if the promise of this summer's offensive is not maintained, then the Germans may be able to recover "most-favored-nation" treatment or something like it, in the Allied markets. If on the other hand the balance of military advantage on land is altered, and if Germany should have few pieces with which to bargain, there seems as yet no force of reason or moderation which can prevent the enactment of the boycott.

In Great Britain, outside the minority for which the *Nation* and the *Manchester Guardian* speak, there is as yet no perception that the notions of boycott and conference are mutually exclusive. The hypnosis of wartime, incredible as it may appear, clouds that elementary fact. The neutral observer will see at once what may dawn on us only after dismal experience. Trading is a relation which implies only a decent minimum of friendship, a cold

exchange of mutual advantage. If even this minimum is forbidden by law, it is idle to imagine that the statesmen of nations engaged in a war of boycotts can sit at a round table, and consider each other's interests with the tolerance and goodwill that a system of conference and conciliation demands. For one nation to refuse to another in its markets the parity of treatment required by "the most-favored-nation" clause, is to enact hatred by statutory process.

The policy described as "conserving our natural resources for the use of our Allies" is even more dangerous. Mr. Bonar Law has already given an object-lesson in its working. He has imposed—so far without parliamentary debate—an export duty of £2 a ton on the palm-kernel produce of the West African colonies, if sent to foreign markets, for a period of five years after the end of the war. The object is avowedly to destroy the thriving German industry, which extracted the oil from these kernels, for manufacture into margarine and soap. If this is a sample of what the Allies propose to do generally, the consequence must be a disturbance of world trade by world politics such as mankind has not known since the eighteenth century. If at the same time Germany's tropical colonies are annexed by the Allies, her industry will see itself deprived of many vital raw materials, and the resources of South America and the Dutch Indies may at first be unequal to the demand. To carry out such a policy effectively there would have to be, one supposes, some regulation of the transit trade through neutral ports, such as the blockade demanded, or else continuation of the still more drastic system of fixing "rations" for neutrals.

Presented with the spectacle of an immense armed coalition, all-powerful at sea, engaged in an incessant war upon its peaceful trade, with closed markets, taxed ships, and hampered supplies, the German nation will experience no reaction against militarism. Rather there would be in the five **critical years that will follow peace**, when opinion is malleable and impressionable, a rally of the whole German nation to defend its pacific development against the terrific menace of this bloodless blockade. The imperialism which closed markets and monopolized profitable concessions was a venal offense against international ideals, in comparison with this new development which threatens to monopolize the world's raw produce, and to use the monopoly for political ends. There could be no advance to the ideal of Areopagus and conference in such a world.

If Europe is to be saved from the calamities threatened by this policy, its salvation can come only from the United States. I am aware that such an appeal from an Englishman to Americans may pro-

voke the cold retort, "Why don't you argue with your own countrymen about it?" The argument has been stated, firmly and boldly enough, by some English writers. It will carry conviction only if it comes from some powerful and impartial observer. The more dramatically it can be presented the better. If the republic which alone can be the architect of a League to Enforce Peace were to define its conditions, if it were to say that any advance was impossible, any consideration futile, while such proposals of boycott are discussed, the incompatibility of the two positions might begin to dawn upon us. The muddled thinking, the beclouded sentimentalism which can talk in one breath of conferences and boycotts, can be brought to sanity only by sharp contact with a mind which has escaped the emotional disturbance of war.

We want an enduring peace. But we do not understand that this peace must depend on the elimination of force as a means of securing economic advantage. The corner-stone of any League of Peace must be, if not free trade, at least the abandonment of political discrimination in trade. The first condition of membership in such a League must be a "most-favored-nation" clause for the benefit of all its members. The second condition ought to be, in all the non-self-governing colonies of the parent states, equality of treatment alike in imports and in exports between the traders of the home country and those of all the member-states. There is latent in this conception of a boycott a valuable contribution towards the future structure of the world. If it could be used not as vengeance for the past, but as a bulwark of security for the future, it might serve a humane purpose. We might promise to all states which agree to the scheme of conciliation and arbitration, equality of economic treatment. We might add that we reserve the penalties of boycott for the state which refuses conciliation, or ignores the Council's award. With such a basis we might honorably approach the enemy. If he will enter the League, the Paris resolutions would be annulled. If he will have none of it, then he is by his own act outside the society of nations. That would be a risky strategy, and wise men, if time were likely to heal our wounds, might prefer to trust to time. But this Paris program is itself a plot against time. It is a scheme to thwart the healing action of forgetfulness. It is preparation for the next war before this war is done. The way of escape is to complete the plan of a pacific League by giving to it a basis of economic fair-dealing. For that the Old World, morally bankrupt while its body lives and fights, looks for leadership to the New.

H. N. BRAILSFORD.

London, July.

What Uncle Sam Does Not Do for Women in Industry

"SHOW her in," said the manufacturer ungraciously. It was another of those impractical pests, an investigator.

"I have been studying factories equipped with your machinery," began the unwelcome guest, "and it struck me that some slight alterations would do away with a good deal of unnecessary strain on the workers."

Off came her gloves and out came her note book and pencil.

"Those foot treadles, for instance; the range is twelve inches and they require one hundred pounds' pressure to operate. Now when a woman steps up twelve inches and presses down a hundred pounds' worth all day long, she is working under a ruinous strain. Why not make the casting with a shorter range—thus—and install it thus, so that she steps *down* on it?"

The practical manufacturer looked at her penciled diagram, then he looked shrewdly at her.

"Where do you come from, anyway?" he asked abruptly.

The impractical one pulled out her credentials. They revealed the imposing title of Chief of the Women's Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

"Well," said the man with a grin, "I give up. What you suggest is perfectly practical. We never thought of it, that's all. We manufacturers have a right to be afraid of you people; usually you throw rocks at us and don't tell us what to do!"

In half an hour they had figured out schemes for relieving the heat with asbestos deflectors and a dozen other simple practical improvements. Then the manufacturer got excited over a plan for getting perfected machinery standardized by the O. K. of the federal government and having the manufacturer share liability with the employer where unapproved machinery is used.

At this interesting point the investigator withdrew because Uncle Sam decided he did not have money enough to waste on allowing her to finish; the manufacturer is still trying to get her back.

Meanwhile she and her small but competent staff of investigators, discouraged by a continual series of similar thwarting experiences, have one and all resigned. One of them has even gone back to a lower-paid position for the sake of working unhampered. The powers that be in the Bureau add a sinister touch of humor by the composure of spirit they display at this wholesale testimonial to their incompetency. The Division no longer exists because no one can be induced to accept appointment.

In fact the brief but significant history of the Women's Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics from its inception nearly five years ago indicates a certain lack of imagination on the part of officials professedly interested in the under dog in industry. Whether or not the Division is to exist in the future must depend on an aroused public sentiment among all those individuals and organizations in the country who recognize that the protection of the eight million women in industry is a challenging national duty.

The great bulk of these women are now overworked, underpaid, toiling all day or all night under conditions thoroughly prejudicial to health and morals. Industry in America is chaotic at many points; nowhere are the deeps so unplumbed, the seas so uncharted as in those factories, workshops, stores and canneries where women comprise the bulk of the workers. Many private organizations are busy on these matters, investigating, scheduling, promoting legislation and legal defense of reform labor laws. It is technical, difficult, discouraging work; the opposed forces are powerful, entrenched; the public and the legislatures ignorant or apathetic; the courts, "judicious."

In the plethora of partial and biased investigations there is little enough of the sound, practical, statistically honest and impartial data on which to base reasonable reforms. It was the business of the Women's Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to supply such data. How ably its work was done is indicated by the fact that from the time of its inception in 1911 it produced fully ten per cent of the Bureau's work on something less than four per cent of the Bureau's appropriation. This gauge of its working capacity seems to indicate that it deserved encouragement under sympathetic administration rather than the curtailment and discrediting, the unintelligent editing and delay of its reports which has recently been its fate. An example of one of the Division's activities will give an estimate of what its value might be.

When the campaign was launched for an eight-hour day for women in the District of Columbia, Dr. Charles P. Neill, then Commissioner of Labor Statistics, took the initiative in putting the Women's Division at the service of the National Consumers' League, the promoter of the bill, not to help pass legislation but to find out what conditions of labor actually obtained in the District. The result was extraordinary. For ten days hearings were held before committees of the House and Senate in which the testimony consisted of blind opposition to the proposed reform on the part of the employers, based on ignorance of conditions within their own plants, and theoretical general arguments on the part of the reformers based on general information but nothing concrete

in regard to Washington. And in the midst of the frankly prejudiced witnesses sat the chief of the Women's Division with the manuscript of the newly completed study on her lap. She was there only to answer questions.

The answers she gave unquestionably constituted the evidence which carried the measure triumphantly past the scepticism of the Senate committee; for the testimony as to hours and wages which prevailed in the nation's capital was damning indeed to the opposition—and to their regard for accuracy. And, inasmuch as it had been gathered from employers as well as employees and had been fairly and ably handled in telling statistical tables, it was concrete, pertinent, unassailable.

So with all the work of this Division—and it is a thing which cannot always be said of the work of the Bureau—it was practical, sound, and readily utilizable by other agencies already in the field to lighten the burden of industry for women. The recent report on unemployment among women in retail stores in Boston is destined to be of considerable assistance to the hard-pressed Minimum Wage Commission of Massachusetts, though it has been very late in appearing in print. It is typical of the way the work of the Women's Division has been obstructed that this report was ready for the printer, so far as the authors were concerned, in June, 1915. Eight months later it began to show first signs of life in the form of advance press notices. Just how far its carefully compiled statistical tables have been tampered with, no mere outsider can quite appreciate; enough was done, however, to cause the investigators who are responsible for the study to withdraw their signatures against the surprised protests of their chief.

"What business is it of ours if the public don't read our statistical tables? It's our business to make them, that's all!" was the candid statement of one Bureau official who seems to have rather too much authority.

The gist of the whole matter is that the powers that be in the Bureau of Labor Statistics are not interested in women; apparently they are too preoccupied with the affairs of men, and if the workmen of America are satisfied with the administration of the Bureau, the obvious reform would be merely to remove from the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Labor Statistics the matters in which women are vitally concerned. For it is a recognized fact that the women's organizations of the country are not satisfied to have the Women's Division die of inanition. It is an easy and cheap retort to say that there need be no such Division because men and women in industry are one. The obvious answer is that man is the one; for a close scrutiny of those studies made by the Bureau in industries in which both men and women are employed shows

little data of value to women, whom legislatures, courts and public opinion treat—and rightly—as a thing apart. In the councils which decide how the year's appropriation shall be spent someone must be admitted who holds a brief for women, for women constitute one in five in industry. One would hate to endorse the idea of a Children's Bureau administered by a man.

Senator Jones of Washington has introduced a bill into the Senate—which Mr. Casey of Pennsylvania is fathering in the House—calling for the creation of a Woman's Division within the Department of Labor, but independent of the Bureau of Labor Statistics or any other Bureau, with adequate salaries and appropriations for expenses. This would give the Division for the first time an actual corporate existence; heretofore its life has been dependent upon the whims and prejudices of the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, its appropriation as large or small a proportion of the money at his disposal as he has chosen to make it. It was at the instance of representatives of the Women's Trade Union League and the National Consumers' League that the bill was introduced, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs has heartily endorsed it. These organizations comprise almost three million women.

It is for every individual and every organization in the country interested in the welfare of working women to do their utmost to wrest from a

reluctant and economical Congress favorable action on the Jones-Casey bill. Following that, they must insist on the appointment of a properly equipped and interested woman as chief.

This is not enough, however. Wholesome publicity, a regular policing of the administration of the funds by the Women's Trade Union League, The Consumers' League, civic clubs and industrial commissions, and an attitude of expectancy on the part of these organizations will be needed as a supplementary step. If a community is in difficulties trying to pass reform laws, trying to administer those laws or defend them before the courts, its citizens have a right, even a duty, to summon the Division to gather for them the "untainted" facts.

The ideal organization of the Division would seem to be a flying squad of expert investigators which could be quickly mobilized and turned from one field of action into another in response to calls for help; and its staff should be large enough to divide and work in several places at once. This, with a guaranty of prompt publication of results edited by the investigators in consultation with editors possessing some sense of social responsibility and of the value of time, would remove the stigma of bureaucracy and would in large measure restore the whole Bureau of Labor Statistics to that position in the public esteem which it should, but which it does not now, occupy.

Creating Governmental Efficiency

A FIRST essential to preparedness is the development of a strong and responsible government—an efficient instrument adapted to the realization of our national purpose and responsive to the will of the people. It is admitted that our government is neither strong nor responsive. The reason why we find ourselves in this condition has been pointed out in earlier issues of THE NEW REPUBLIC. We have attempted the impossible. We have tried to set up a government "by the people" on a foundation of distrust—distrust of the executive by the people, and distrust of the people by our constitution-makers. Our constitutions have been made acceptable to the people who distrusted the executive by limitations which have prevented the development of strength in the government. They have been made acceptable to those who distrusted the people by making the electorate ineffective as an agency for impressing the will of a majority on the government. And under these constitutional practices have grown up that have perverted the whole representative system.

There is only one way to eliminate popular distrust of the executive and that is to give the people an effective means for making the executive accountable and responsive to the expressed will of the majority. Means must be found for making both the representative body and the electorate function effectively as instruments of popular control.

If we are to reestablish the representative branch of the government as an effective instrument of popular control it is absolutely essential to confine its activities to review, criticism, approval and disapproval of the acts and proposals of the executive on matters having to do with the conduct of public affairs. This done, the people themselves will demand a strong executive leadership, and the issues which then arise, when the acts and proposals of the executive are not supported by a majority of representatives, must necessarily find their way "to the people."

Furthermore, when the executive and the legislative body come to work together in this normal

relation—the executive as responsible leader and the representative body as the reviewing, critical and approving agent of the people on matters of controlling policy and financial support—procedures will develop which are adapted to enforcing accountability and responsiveness to the public demands. These are conclusions which are supported by all of the experience of the last century in efforts to make coöperative management, both public and private, efficient.

Institutional changes are best brought about when they come as a matter of gradual evolution. After a century of drifting away from the ideals of representative government, the problems of restoring our institutions to normal working relations between the executive and the legislature must be approached practically. We must take into account what is and with this before us decide what can best be done. It is well first to consider what can be done by the national government. Accepting the characterization of President Wilson that we have a government of “congressional supremacy,” let us first consider what Congress can do. The easiest thing for Congress to do is to change its own rules.

To what extent, may we ask, is it possible for the national representative body to establish normal working relations with the executive branch through change of rules? The Constitution vests the “executive power” in the President and requires him “to give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient”; it also requires that the executive shall “prepare and publish a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public moneys”; and as a matter of practice these recommendations and accounts are submitted to Congress at the beginning of each session. Simply by a change of rules Congress may provide that as soon as practicable after each session has been organized, the House of Representatives or both houses in joint session, shall resolve themselves into a committee of the whole to consider the “accounts” and “recommendations” of the President. Simply by a change of rules Congress can request the President and his advisers to meet with it in committee of the whole to explain their “accounts” and “recommendations,” to answer questions of members concerning them, to meet criticism and defend their proposals, and to do this openly and publicly. This would at once throw the whole business of the government open to public discussion. It would make the President responsible for the care and wisdom with which financial and other business plans were prepared and for the fidelity and efficiency with which plans approved and authority granted were executed. This would also give to each member of Congress a chance to

inform himself on any detail concerning which he might desire information before voting.

The rules governing the meetings of the committee of the whole, if such a practice were adopted, could also be amended so as to make each member of Congress responsible for his action in supporting or opposing executive requests for appropriations. This desirable result could be achieved by requiring that the estimates for each office shall be taken in turn on the floor and separately voted on as is done in other countries having a budget procedure. Then, after the committee of the whole had arisen and reported, money bills might be introduced, as is the usual practice and as is required by the Constitution. They might even be brought in at the end of the session without making finance legislation a farce. For when appropriation bills were submitted, each member of Congress—and for that matter, each citizen—could know what they were all about.

Responsibility could be definitely located as between the executive and the legislative branch by the simple rule that has prevailed in England for more than two hundred years and has been adopted by nearly all other countries having a budget procedure—that is, for Congress to deny itself and its members the right to increase items of appropriations requested by the executive, thereby limiting their powers to approval of items submitted, or to a cutting down of amounts requested when appropriations are made. Then, in case the executive were open to criticism for not having requested enough, the burden of proposing amendments would be placed on the President. In so far as increases in appropriations were proved desirable the President would be under pressure to recommend them, in order to protect himself against a hostile minority, and against the risk of losing the support of a majority.

But it may be urged that the President and his advisers might refuse to appear before a committee of the whole. To meet this contingency, however, Congress could, if it saw fit, pass a law requiring a budget to be prepared and submitted by the secretary of the treasury; and since the secretary of the treasury is responsible to the President, such a requirement would necessarily make the executive responsible. Congress might also require by statute that each head of a department appear before the committee of the whole while sitting on finance measures, although it could not make such an act binding on the President. Thereby Congress could put responsibility for the preparation of a working program and a plan of financing where it belongs. It could provide for publicity through criticism and discussion, both of accounts and estimates; it could give current news value to matters of public business. This procedure would

in effect make Congress an open forum for the initial consideration of all the acts and plans of the officers on whom the people must depend for the conduct of affairs.

Congress by its own act can therefore institute reforms of procedure of wide-reaching importance. It cannot without constitutional amendment institute the equally essential reform of establishing a method for direct appeal to the people on a current issue. In case there were a majority against the President and this majority refused to pass the finance measures recommended by the executive, Congress could not give to the President the right "to go to the country"; nor could Congress by resolution call a new election to determine whose leadership would be supported. For governmental efficiency such a right of appeal to the people is essential, yet it can not be created without a change in the Constitution.

But Congress could pass, by resolution, a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would give either to the President or to Congress a right to call a new election in case of deadlock, and if this proposed amendment were adopted by the states, we could have a government both political branches of which could be held immediately accountable to the electorate. We could have a government also that would be trusted, for no administration could be continued in office unless it commanded the confidence of a majority.

This leads to a very interesting question. What might happen under our present Constitution if a rule or statute were adopted governing the consideration of estimates such as is suggested above? Let us suppose that a budget were submitted by the President and Congress refused to support it. Or let us suppose that a majority of Congress did not like the way that past appropriations had been expended. For either of these reasons Congress might refuse to pass appropriations. Then what might happen? A majority could continue to withhold action on appropriations requested until the President dissolved his cabinet and appointed executive heads who would have the confidence of members of the representative body. In this event the issues raised between Congress and the executive could rest until the next election. Such action by Congress would necessarily result in a form of responsible government similar to that of France.

The same changes could be made with equal facility and advantage in our state governments. In states where annual elections are held, as in New York, the issue raised between the executive and a hostile majority of the legislature could come before the people at the next election, so that reference to the electorate could not be long delayed. In the states, therefore, by changes of rules and modifications of statute law without constitutional

amendment, there could be a more immediate control exercised over both the efficiency of administration and responsiveness of both branches of the government to the will of the people.

The people in the states are becoming alive to the need for this sort of thing. As a result of the fact that the states have already reached a condition of deficit financing, there is an increased demand for a budget procedure which will put responsibility on the executive not only for giving an account of himself but for preparing and submitting to the legislature a well considered finance plan based on the needs of the service. New Jersey has just passed such an executive-budget law. The Maryland legislature has submitted to voters a constitutional amendment that will come before them at the next election. Several states have like measures under consideration. But neither statutes nor constitutional amendments can have force without a militant public opinion which will insist on a procedure requiring finance measures to be considered, criticized, discussed, approved, or disapproved openly and publicly in the legislature—the established forum of democracy and the only forum in which public business can be adequately considered with due regard to all parties in interest.

The chief obstacle to overcoming our constitutional weakness is not to be found in any lack of knowledge of what institutional changes are adapted to making the government both efficient and responsive to public demand, but in the difficulty that must be experienced in getting an effective majority of the people to come to a common view about what is to be done. The obstacle is psychological rather than technical. The initial work is educational rather than experimental.

Being without official leadership in this as well as in matters of management, we must rely on unofficial leadership. It is a fair presumption that until the people come to demand a practice which has been found to be effective, those within the government who have been working with the old methods will find reasons for preserving the status quo. For like reason we cannot look to the political "boss" for this kind of leadership.

It is within the power of Congress to establish normal working relations between the executive and the legislative branches of the national government, and to do this by simple process of change of rules or by statute. But it is questionable whether this will be done until a demand for it has developed that is strong enough to force a change in the Constitution. A constitutional amendment, once passed, would give to procedures greater security. But it would also give greater rigidity. Reform through constitutional amendment, moreover, necessarily entails long delay.

FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND.

The Woman's Party

THE Congressional Union believes in nothing but Realpolitik. It has ideals but it does not wear them on its sleeve. Like Goethe, it believes in facts. The Woman's party is a fact. That a very small percentage of the women voters of the West can decide the fate of the presidential and congressional elections is a fact. That thousands of women with brains, training, experience in public affairs, determination and money are prepared to fight to the bitter end for the Federal Suffrage amendment is a fact. That the Union has thousands of voters pledged to stand by the cause and defeat political parties that will not do justice to women is a fact. It is aware that it cannot now swing the entire mass of women voters, but it also knows that it does not have to swing more than a few thousand in each state. Thus armed, it does not beg, it does not wheedle, it does not whine. It wages a trench warfare with exactly the kind of weapons that men use. It knows that no other kind is effective. It speaks a language which the most seasoned and cynical politician can understand. It has money and organization and will and votes. It does not argue with males that the nature of woman is worthy of freedom. It appeals to women and informs men.

Dealing with facts, the Congressional Union marches from achievement to achievement. Its first triumph was in 1914 when for the first time in the history of the country both houses of Congress thought woman suffrage deserving of real consideration in the form of a vote. It was defeated and then it carried the campaign into the suffrage states against the Democrats whose party was in power and hence responsible for the action of Congress. Without organization and money at that time, the Union thoroughly frightened Democratic politicians from the West, as thousands of letters and clippings in the Union office prove. The second achievement was the first national convention of women voters at San Francisco in September, 1915, which was speedily followed by the announcement that President Wilson and the members of his official family would vote for woman suffrage—in New Jersey. The third achievement was the formation of the Woman's Party at Chicago in 1916 and the statesmanlike presentation of the woman's cause which won from the Republicans the strong endorsement of the principle of woman suffrage on the ground of justice. The great party of Mr. Lodge, Mr. Crane, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Root, and Mr. Butler, "as a measure of justice," favored the extension of suf-

frage to women. The Union's fourth achievement was at St. Louis where the Democratic party approved equal franchise by recommending it to the states.

Of course, both parties sought to evade genuine responsibility by falling back on "squatter sovereignty." They endorsed woman suffrage but avoided mentioning the Federal amendment. Tradition has it that Mr. Lodge winked at Mr. Harding when he read the suffrage plank and that the Democrats adopted the principle "just to appease the western women." Apparently all that was needed to "take suffrage out of politics" was a new Dred Scott decision by a packed Supreme Court. But those who laughed up their sleeves, if there were any such, soon began to discover the inexorable logic of the position in which they had placed themselves. The Republicans declare that "justice" demands the enfranchisement of women, but the party of Hamilton, Webster, Lincoln, and Roosevelt—the party that has twice saved this nation from going to pieces—stultifies itself by sacrificing justice on the altar of the Democratic superstition which twice almost destroyed the nation—"states' rights."

Inasmuch as this conclusion is not final but temporary, it is comical. The conclusion is subject to revision. The Republican party is the party of such nationalism as we now have and it cannot carry that nationalism to triumph without the West. Every other successful Republican candidate since the foundation of the party, except Mr. Roosevelt, who got into power through the assassination of a western President, has been a western man. Lincoln, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Harrison, McKinley were all western men. The one eastern candidate whom the Republican party deliberately nominated, previous to Mr. Hughes, James G. Blaine, was defeated. The Republicans now inform the western women that equal suffrage is just, but that respect for a discredited Democratic shibboleth which cost this country the blood of a million sons and the sacrifices of a million women prevents the party from doing justice. Of course this will be sufficient for some women voters, but it will not be sufficient for that marginal minority of women voters, grounded in the principles of the Congressional Union, who will decide the day. Moreover, how are the eastern Republican leaders going to meet the demand of the eastern women for state legislative action granting presidential suffrage? Are they going to say: "Oh, come now, you know that platform plank was not our honest

opinion, but designed to catch votes in the present suffrage states?" Surely they would not want teachers of government and politics in our schools and colleges, whom they call upon to uphold American institutions, to be forced to record that wise, honorable, and responsible gentlemen, in whose keeping the fortunes of our beloved country are so largely cast, have resorted to immoral subterfuges for temporary gain. We are rightly told by Mr. Hughes himself that the absence of conviction is a mortal sin for college students.

And what of the Democrats, the party of Jefferson, the party of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, the party that has written "consent of the governed" into the political doctrines of this nation? Mr. Wilson, its spokesman, has made much of the platform of 1912. He informed the women at Washington in 1914 that he could not help them because Mr. Bryan had not thought of them during the hot days at Baltimore. He was scrupulously precise in stating that his party had not spoken at his nomination in favor of woman suffrage. In 1916, Mr. Wilson wrote his own platform and by his own deliberate act prevented his party from going on record in favor of a national amendment. With a bland smile upon his countenance, he now tells the women that he must still abide by the dictates of his party. To the Congressional Union this is worse than hypocrisy, contemptible hypocrisy. The President seeks to degrade the members of the Union in their own eyes by assuming that they cannot see through this painfully obvious and clumsy bit of political legerdemain. The Congressional Union will inform the western women that Mr. Wilson believes in woman suffrage—in New Jersey—enough to ask for their votes, but not enough to stand aside and permit his own party to endorse the national cause. On this "tricky politician," the Union leaders declare, "we will wage relentless war—war until enough of the enfranchised women are consciously mobilized to make the return of such a leader and such a party impossible. The Democratic party is now in power and refuses to pass the Anthony amendment. Let us give the Republicans their chance." This mobilization may not be done in a day, but it will be done, unless wise statesmen see that to alienate a great host of leading women would be a national evil beyond repair.

Such are the facts on which the Woman's Party rides to power. It is, as someone has said, "a contemptible minority," but it knows the history of minorities in politics. Its agitation is called a "rub-a-dub-dub" affair. So was that of the abolitionist. That it has created a political situation for the leaders of both parties is a fact of recognized significance. Only Mr. Wilson's blind admirers deny it, and in vain. The women's conven-

tion in Chicago, by the records of the press and eye-witnesses, was a triumph. It was marked by the absence of the maudlin sentiment, crude emotionalism, and open demagoguery which have been too painfully apparent in every man's convention since the origin of American political parties. It knows what it wants. It makes no compromises and offers no concessions. Justice is not subject to truck and barter. With more intelligence than is shown by most male citizens it recognizes that party responsibility is the hope of democracy, and that great results are not to be attained by wheedling individuals or electing "good" men but by holding parties—their organization, leadership, rank and file—responsible for promises and performances.

The Woman's party says to political leaders: "You declare that our cause is just and that you favor it. Prove your honesty by helping us win at once by the easiest method." The Congressional Union does not propose to waste time trying to win that portion of public ignorance that is influenced by parades, or doling out cakes and ale on election days. It refuses to ogle and "smile sweetly for the gentlemen." It will not go out into the streets to plead with loafers. It will not weep in public about mother and home. Its leaders are willing to plead with the voters for other causes, but they will not take a sex conflict to the gutters. They know that every man who really believes in the "justice" of their cause will give his support to the Federal amendment, that talk about states' rights when three-fourths of the states must give their consent, is either ignorance or hypocrisy, and that the shortest cut is through responsible legislative action. Especially, they will not listen to the opponents of direct government who tell them that democracy requires a referendum.

It is no band of fanatics that the Congressional Union is mobilizing. It is no "lost cause" which it proposes to champion. Every organization of women in the country—the millions of club women and teachers—has endorsed woman suffrage. The parties—all of them—have endorsed it. Nine-tenths of the intellectual leaders among the women have endorsed it. An ever increasing stream of informed women is pouring out of our schools and colleges. Political tutelage is unnecessary for those to whom the gateways of knowledge are open. The inexorable social forces of the age are marshalled on the side of woman suffrage. The integration of America demands that this great national force be drawn into the main current of our active public life. Fortified by the logic of events, by political facts, by the justice of the cause, the Congressional Union will continue to mobilize and fight until the victory is won. Wise men will not allow the inevitable to make trouble for them;

they will forestall it. The women are now victorious. The only question that remains is: "What party has the vision to behold the day and what leader can rise to the heights which Abraham Lincoln mounted on January 1st, 1863?"

CHARLES A. BEARD.

Any Stick Will Do to Beat a Dog

READER, possibly on one of your country walks you have come upon a man with his back against a hedge, tormented by a fiend in the likeness of a dog. You yourself, of course, are not a coward. You possess that cornerstone of virtue, a love for animals. If at your heels a dog sniffs and growls, you humor his mistake, you flick him off and proceed with unbroken serenity. But pity this other whose heart is less stoutly wrapped! He has gone forth on a holiday to take the country air, to thrust himself into the freer wind, to poke with his stick for such signs of spring as may be hiding in the winter's leaves. Or maybe he seeks a hilltop for a view of the fields that lie below, patched in many colors as though Nature had been sewing at her garments, mending the cloth from her bag of scraps and basting the seams with fences.

On such a journey this fellow is traveling when, at a turn of the road, he hears the sound of barking. As yet there is no dog in sight. He pauses. How shall one know, he wonders, whether the sound comes up a wrathful gullet or whether the dog bays at him impersonally, as at the distant moon? Or maybe he vents himself upon a stubborn cow. Is it best to go roundabout, or forward with such a nice compound of innocence, boldness and modesty as shall satisfy the beast? If one engross oneself in something that lies to the lee of danger, it allays suspicion. Or if one absorb oneself upon the flora—a primrose on the river's brim—it shows him clear and stainless. The stupidest dog should see that so close a student can have no evil in him. Perhaps it would be better to throw away one's stick lest it make a show of violence. Or it may be concealed along the outer leg.

Ministers of grace defend us, what an excitement in the barnyard! Not one dog, but many, come running out. There is a rumor that there is a stranger to be eaten, and it's likely—if they keep to their clamor—there will be a bone for each. Note how the valor oozes from the man of peace. Observe his sidling gate, his skirts pulled close, his hollowed back, his head bent across his shoulder. Watch him mince his steps, lest a lingering heel be nipped. Listen to him try the foremost dog with

names, to gull him to a belief that they have met before in happier circumstances!

You remember the fellow in the play who would have loved war had they not digged villainous saltpetre from the harmless earth. The countryside, too, in my opinion, would be more peaceful of a summer afternoon were it not overrun with dogs. Let me be plain. I myself like dogs—sleepy dogs blinking in the firelight, friendly dogs with wagging tails, young dogs in their first puppyhood with their teeth scarce sprouted, whose jaws have not yet burgeoned into danger, and old dogs, too, who sun themselves and give forth hollow, toothless, reassuring sounds. A dog of vegetarian aspect pleases me. Let him bear a mild eye as though he were nourished on the softer foods! I would wish every dog to have a full complement of tail. It's the sure barometer of his warm regard. There's no art to find the mind's construction in the face. And I would have him with not too much curiosity. It's a quality that brings him too often to the gate. It makes him prone to sniff. Nor do I like dogs addicted to sudden excitement. Lethargy becomes them better. Let them be without the Gallic graces! In general I like a dog to whom I have been properly introduced, with an exchange of credentials. While the dog is by, let his master address me in softest tones to cement the understanding. At bench shows I love the noble beasts, though I keep to the middle of the aisle. The streets are all the safer when so many of the creatures are kept within.

Frankly, I would enjoy the country more if I knew that all the dogs were away on visits. Of course the highroad is quite safe. Its frequent traffic is its insurance. Then, too, the stable is at such a distance, it is only a monstrous anger can bring the dog. But maybe you are hot and thirsty, and there is a well at the side of the house. All about there is an ominous silence. To the practised eye, there is a look of "dog." Or maybe a lane leads down to the river. Even at this distance you hear the shallow brawl of water on the stones. Or a path goes off across a hill. Shall we follow the hot pavement, or shall we dare these lonely stretches, where beasts may rise to plague us?

There is a French village near Quebec whose population is chiefly dogs. It lies along the river in a single street, not many miles from the point where Wolfe climbed to the Plains of Abraham. There are a hundred houses flat against the roadway and on the steps of each there sits a dog. As I went through on foot, each of these dogs picked me up, examined me nasally and passed me on, not generously as though I had stood the test, but rather in deep suspicion that I was a queer fellow, not to be penetrated at first, but one who would surely be found out and gobbled before coming to the end of

the street. As long as I should eventually furnish the common banquet, it mattered not which dog took the first nip. It would be better to wait until all were gathered about the platter. "Good neighbor dog" each seemed to say, "do you too sniff upon the rogue! If he be honest, my old nose is much at fault." Meantime, I padded lightly through the village, at first calling on the dogs by English names, but later using such bits as I had of French: "*Aucassin, mon pauvre chien. Voici, Tintagiles, alors donc mon cheri,*" but with little effect.

I am convinced that I am not alone in my—shall I say diffidence?—towards dogs. Indeed, there is evidence from the oldest times that mankind in its more honest moments has confessed to a fear of dogs. In recognition of this general fear the unmuzzled Cerberus was put at the gate of Hades. It was rightly felt that when the unhappy pilgrims got within, that the fifty snapping heads were better than a bolt upon the door. He, also, who first spoke the ancient proverb, "Let sleeping dogs lie," did no more than voice the caution of the street.

It was Daniel who sat with the lions. But there are degrees of bravery. On Long Street within sight of my window—just where the street gets into its most tangled traffic—there has hung for many years the painted signboard of a veterinary surgeon. Its artist was in the first flourish of youth. The surgeon's name is set up in modest letters, but the horse below flames with color. What a flaring nostril! What an eager eye! How arched the neck! Here is a wrath and speed unknown to the quadrupeds of this present Long Street. Such mild-eyed, sharp-ribbed horses as now infest the curb, mere whittlings from a larger age, hang their heads at their degeneracy. Indeed, these horses seem to their owners to be not worth the price of a nostrum. And of a consequence the doctor's work has fallen off. It has become a rare occasion when it is permitted him to stroke his chin in contemplation of some inner palsy. Therefore, to give his wisdom scope, the doctor some time since announced the cellar of the building to be a hospital for dogs. Must I press the analogy? I have seen the doctor with bowl and spoon in hand take leave of the cheerful world. He opens the cellar door. A curdling yelp comes up the stairs. In the abyss below there are ten dogs at least, all of them sick, all dangerous. Not since Orion first led his hunting pack across the heavens has there been so fierce a sound. The door closes. There is a final yelp, such as greets a bone. Doubtless by this time they are munching on the doctor. Good sir, had you lived in pre-apostolic days, your name would have been linked with Daniel's in the hymn. I might have spent my earliest treble in your praise.

CHARLES S. BROOKS.

CORRESPONDENCE

Socialist Labor Platform

SIR: I was much interested in reading your editorials in the June 24th issue of THE NEW REPUBLIC, on the political situation in the 1916 campaign. You express the views of many when you say "Both of the two major political parties are more in the wrong than either of them is in the right"; but I for one would like you to be more explicit as to the Socialists, there being two parties in the United States claiming to represent socialism. As the Socialist party is more in the lime-light than the Socialist Labor party, probably you mean its candidate, Allan Benson, when you say, "We are prevented from supporting the Socialist ticket because its candidate is not fit to be President and because any administration which acted on its program would land the country in disaster." Many will agree with you in this statement, but there is a difference between the Socialist party and its candidate, and the Socialist Labor party and Arthur E. Reimer, the candidate for that party. The latter party has a very constructive program for an Industrial Democracy which Mr. Reimer is well fitted to carry out. Considering you made the statement quoted above as to the Socialist ticket, will you please in justice to the Socialist Labor party print this letter and the platform of the Socialist Labor party, so your readers may decide whether its program would "land the country in disaster," or whether it might not be a very constructive one.

ELIZABETH S. KINGMAN.

Pittsfield, Massachusetts.

PLATFORM OF THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE PARTY
IN NEW YORK, APRIL 30, 1916

The Socialist Labor party, in national convention assembled, reaffirming its previous platform declarations, reasserts the right of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We hold that the purpose of government is to secure to every citizen the enjoyment of this right; but taught by experience we hold furthermore that such right is illusory to the majority of the people, to wit, the working class, under the present system of economic inequality that is essentially destructive of THEIR life, THEIR liberty, and THEIR happiness.

We hold that the true theory of economics is that the means of production must be owned, operated, and controlled by the people in common. Man cannot exercise his right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness without the ownership of the land on, and the tool with which to work. Deprived of these, his life, his liberty, and his fate fall into the hands of that class which owns these essentials for work and production.

We hold that the existing contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation—the latter resulting from the private ownership of the natural and social opportunities—divides the people into two classes: the Capitalist Class and the Working Class; throws society into the convulsions of the Class Struggle; and perverts government in the interests of the Capitalist Class.

Thus Labor is robbed of the wealth it alone produces, is denied the means of self-employment, and, by compulsory idleness in wage-slavery, is even deprived of the necessities of life.

Against such a system the Socialist Labor party raises the

banner of revolt, and demands the unconditional surrender of the Capitalist Class.

In place of such a system the Socialist Labor party aims to substitute a system of social ownership of the means of production, industrially administered by the Working Class,—the workers to assume control and direction as well as operation of their industrial affairs.

This solution of necessity requires the organization of the Working Class as a class upon revolutionary political and industrial lines.

We therefore call upon the wage workers to organize themselves into a revolutionary political organization under the banner of the Socialist Labor party; and to organize themselves likewise upon the industrial field into a revolutionary industrial union in keeping with their political aims.

And we also call upon all other intelligent citizens to place themselves squarely upon the ground of Working Class interests, and join us in this mighty and noble work of human emancipation, so that we may put summary end to the existing barbarous class conflict by placing the land and all the means of production, transportation, and distribution into the hands of the people as a collective body, and substituting the Co-operative Commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war and social disorder—a commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his faculties, multiplied by all the modern factors of civilization.

England Right or Wrong

SIR: I wish to discuss one point in your reply to "Scepticus" (p. 122, issue of June 3rd). "Scepticus" asks what would have happened if England rather than Germany had committed an international crime like the invasion of Belgium at the beginning of this war. To this you reply, "The question puts a hypothetical case which is irrelevant to actual facts. If previous to the war Great Britain had not only commanded the sea but had possessed an army large enough to undertake aggressive warfare on the European Continent, her power would have manifestly endangered the security of other nations. . . . It was because she possessed only a small army that she was allowed to control the sea."

The argument, although one-sided, contains a measure of truth, of course, but it strikes me as being itself irrelevant to the hypothetical case under discussion. In other words, you have surely played the word *like* for considerably more than it is worth. Thus, apart from not a few other possibilities, England might well have begun the war by seizing Copenhagen—a feat the successful accomplishment of which by no means presupposes the possession of a military establishment of anything like continental dimensions. I might clinch the point by adding that Copenhagen is on an island, but I don't want to be flippant, so I refrain. But let me put a question slightly different from that of "Scepticus." If England rather than Germany were the criminal in the case, would THE NEW REPUBLIC, equipped as it is with a feeling for Realpolitik, be advocating an abandonment of our neutrality and an alliance or understanding with the Central Powers? I for my part don't think so. Furthermore, that you would not advocate an embargo under the given conditions may justly be inferred from the following well thought out if not well expressed statement of yours: "Neutral trading nations cannot use the weapon of commercial non-intercourse against the Power which controls

the seas . . . without being ready and willing to go to war with the naval Power." The truth of this statement was well illustrated during the Boer War, when England experienced no difficulty in using us as a source of supplies, despite our pretty general lack of sympathy with her methods and ambitions in South Africa.

On the whole, then, it seems probable that England, right or wrong, in the future as in the past will be able to count on our aid. This very fact, however, makes urgent our need of securing a voice in her councils. Obviously we cannot do this unless we agree to share her burdens and work in concord with her. Consequently I am in sympathy with THE NEW REPUBLIC's proposal that we enter into an alliance with England. To enter into such an alliance at the present time, however, would in all probability mean only that we, however public our protests and washings of hands, should have to shoulder part of the responsibility and pay part of the price for the Russification of Poland, the dismemberment of the Central Powers and all the rest of the Entente program, and for me at least the dose is at once too big and too bitter.

KEMP MALONE.

Copenhagen, Denmark.

Breaking the Silence

SIR: The ethical substratum unifying your policy is, if I mistake not, a certain insistence upon honesty in regard to motives and interests in thought and event. Incidentally this has involved the breaking of several inert circles of public opinion and public silence.

My word, apropos your recent treatment of the New York charities situation, will not be news, but it will be honest. The *Menace* amuses rather than annoys me, though its net effect is probably pro-Catholic. But I bear witness to your readers that in a recent tour of eighteen large cities, chiefly east of the Mississippi and north of Mason and Dixon's line, I found only one or two cities in which the non-Catholic social workers of the city did not dread the influence or control of the Catholic clergy in the social institutions of the city, especially those dealing with children.

My notes tell me that this information came in each city confidentially from men and women who through long service and conservative judgment had earned general confidence in the community.

The attitude of the priest was almost universally described spontaneously as silent, evasive, non-committal. Occasionally at first they come forward very willingly in progressive movements and seem to coöperate for a while, and then suddenly we discover that they are conspicuous by their absence. They hold aloof but seldom oppose openly.

The Catholics are simply following their interests, which to them are *ipso facto* best for all the world, as most of us feel our own are. What is needful, however, is a clear public analysis of those interests in relation to modern social movements. That is why I was disappointed in Dr. Santayana's article, with the attractive but misleading title, appearing in your last volume. I cannot fill the order. I merely challenge some abler writer with my conclusions:

The Protestant forgets his creed and is able without qualm to espouse any cause which his economic and other interests permit. The Catholic, more consistent, more brainy, more disciplined, brings all things, civic as well as ethical, to the touchstone of his doctrine. Does it fit as

corollary to some proposition in that close-knit system rooting back into fundamental dogmas? If so, the Church can undertake it—preferably doing it for itself; next best, controlling its agencies.

The relatively progressive priest perhaps espouses anything not explicitly forbidden by his memory of doctrine but, in the psychology of the legal advocate, he often finds that his view was "not the law" in a higher tribunal. He had been mistaken. The syllogisms in such and such a matter ran back to original sin, or the unimportance of this world or of the body, or to God's curse on woman, or the prerogative of confession. Finally like the Mohammedan violator of the Alexandrian library they say, "If it be not true doctrine, it is evil; if there be anything good in it, it is already in the true doctrine, and is therefore superfluous." "The Catholic Church anticipated that long ago," is the last answer.

Will "the old ones die off?" This is the frequent hope of the new blood in every social group, social workers included. Is it also the secret wish of the young priest? Father Sullivan, tell us!

R. F. R.

Oakland, California.

From Doubts to Views

SIR: Pardon me if I disbelieve in the reality of Randall Dane—the author of "Fears and Scruples" in your issue of June 24th. He's too wonderful—wonderful because a man who can ask the questions and raise the points he does is not baffled. He has fastened his hooks beneath the surface and he is having a lot of fun watching the mental and spiritual contortions of men of the type he pretends to be.

But let us suppose he is genuine. At least the type he describes is real and he'll serve very fittingly as a target for my remarks. Let me first explain that I was once like him except that when I quit being so I was under thirty. I was quite convinced of the rightness of things and quite particular of my neighbor's opinions of me. I wanted to be mayor of my city and governor of my state. But I, like Mr. Dane, felt that something was wrong. I found that I agreed too well with people I hated. I was successful in my sphere. I had the best job about the place, and my employer, after raising my salary, thought he had me where I would stay put.

But he didn't. Getting leave of absence for a few months I went down to New York—from Methodist, Ford-ridden Iowa, by the way. There I spent my months, my money and my prospects for the governorship. I studied and I mingled. I met big men and small. I found that most anarchists are more cultured than most Iowa women's clubs. I found I could mix in an I. W. W. riot and feel all my sympathies with the rioters. (And how I had damned the I. W. W. while in Iowa.) But I had to leave my dear New York for family reasons before I had got all of it I wanted and before I had become sufficiently settled in mind or proficient in my vocation to make a living there on a plane tolerable to my family.

But I developed from that expedition what Mr. Dane is seeking—views. And they were my own. When I got back to Iowa I knew why I hated some of the people I agreed with. But I didn't agree with them any more. I was a misfit in the life of the community, but I was happier and I was growing.

You, Mr. Dane, I think, are standing on the brink of a new life. You have sensed the mind-killing blight of wealth

and respectability. You have been snatched from the moral certainties of Methodism and Bull Mooseism. You may become poorer in property but you will be richer in self-realization and intellectual honesty. You will know that right bears no necessary relation to legality. You will learn that your fellow clubmen or business associates are members of a conspiracy, conscious or unconscious, to suppress truth and humanity. You will learn that patriotism is of two kinds. One is a broad hope for humanity; the other is a debauch of sentiment which generally serves the purpose which its exhorters intend, that is, to drown the voice of justice and the appeal of the absolute virtues. You will learn that men who will spit on the patriotism of Roosevelt and the boy scouts and the steel trust will die for the patriotism of Lincoln and Wilson. You will learn that flag-worship is a species of idolatry demanding human sacrifices more terrible than any graven image. You will appreciate that the heroes of war are not the passion-blind youths and the wife-deserting "patriots" but the weeping women. You will learn that your mayor and editor are not themselves; they are acting parts in a morality play. You will realize that many high places are filled with intellectual crooks, and you will thank God that there is a NEW REPUBLIC in which the untrammelled mind may disport itself as it cannot in your favorite newspapers and magazines.

The curious phenomenon of our times, Mr. Dane, is that, having all the forms of freedom, the bulk of our people—especially the middle classes, the Iowa Methodists and the patriotic orators—take these forms for the substance and are thus turned off the trail. They quit fighting for their rights and fight for a dollar more on their pay checks and a dollar less on their rent. To get your sea-legs in our modern society, Mr. Dane, you don't need to be a Socialist with a big S. But you have got to get into the spirit of admitting a thing or two. And a vital experience, an experience that will muss up your clothes and social position, will help.

R. C. B.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

Dr. Hill Misquoted

SIR: Will you kindly state in your paper that in the enclosed clipping, in which you represent me as protesting against arousing unrest by fomenting the "delusion that more is earned than is received," you attribute to me words which I never used, and which I disavow and disbelieve. I believe hundreds of thousand receive far less than they really earn, and I should like to have them receive what is due. What I condemn is deluding people with the error that more is due to them than they honestly earn, that is, "rightly coming to them." I cannot think you would purposely misrepresent me, and if you read the passage in my book on "Americanism," I think you cannot without such a purpose represent me as holding what the clipping attributes to me.

DAVID J. HILL.

Cohasset, Massachusetts.

[NOTE: Our paragraph read: "In a review of Dr. David Jayne Hill's new book, 'Americanism: What It Is,' the New York Times says: 'The Doctor protests against arousing unrest by fomenting the delusion that more is earned than received. . . .'" It was therefore the Times which made the erroneous statement on which our remarks were founded.—THE EDITORS.]

The Gallic Cock

Gaspard, by René Benjamin. Translation by Selmer Fougner. Brentano's, New York. \$1.35 net.

"GASPARD" is a war-novel, and a lovely piece of work. To those who have been at all attentive to the literature occasioned by the war, and have seen practically every writer of ante-bellum reputation, from Andreyev to Barrie, unable to rise above the mêlée and contribute anything to the glory of his craft, the statement will doubtless recall the old jest commencing, "Here lies buried a lawyer and an honest man." But M. René Benjamin, the author of "Gaspard," was not before the war a writer of reputation. Whatever the significance of the fact, and it may have none at all, it is still a curious coincidence that in both France and Germany, since the beginning of the struggle, the best work has been produced by new men, by men in active service, helped on the battlefield and in mortal peril itself, to literary achievement. Romain Rolland tells us that the best bit of writing lately done in Germany is the work of a young lieutenant, Fritz von Unruh. And the charming book of "poilu" René Benjamin bears witness that so far in France, too, the honors of literature as well as those of war have gone to an author who has been risking his life for his country.

It is, of course, pending the conclusion of the conflict, out of the question to demand of anyone a work of art pretending to an expression of the actual significance of the war. Indispensable conditions to such a production would be an elevation above current events and a composure of emotion at present necessarily wanting. "Gaspard" makes no pretense of being such a work. Primarily, it is little more than the record of the experiences of the soldiery. What lifts it above the capable descriptions of the combats so voluminously produced since July, 1914, is a certain sense of actual experience that informs it, and engages the participation of the reader. He feels immediately that instead of being the chronicle of campaigns registered by the eye of, say, a war-correspondent, it is the chronicle of campaigns imprinted on every sense by fatigue, by hunger, by heat, by laceration, by an anguish, physical and spiritual, which even the imminence of death cannot obliterate—war as it comes to the civilian soldier, narrated faithfully if with classic and French reserve. The sensation of things actually felt that it imparts would alone have served to distinguish the book. But with only that to recommend it, it would never have been "Gaspard." The beauty of the little work lies in something that has come into it almost unknown, one might say, to the author. Was M. Benjamin aware of what was breathing through his tale of the warfare of the snail-merchant from Montparnasse? One can only guess. But whether present consciously or unconsciously, there is in the book a spirit that evokes immediately the France that has so marvellously disappointed her enemies, the France recreated by the war. Without any straining after allegory, without the slightest departure from the forms of a fine and nervous narrative, by virtue of just this pervading buoyancy and courage and vigor, the little story is a fitting symbol of the land that produced it.

And yet it is absolutely clean of chauvinism. Nothing perhaps better illustrates the author's attitude toward his material than his lack of concern with the enemy. The "Sacré albosches" are there, one knows, behind the murderous fire that falls on the grain-fields of Lorraine, on the other side of the freezing line of Argonne trenches where for the second time Gaspard faces death. The soldiers joke

TIFFANY & Co.

EMERALD CUT DIAMONDS

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

not bitterly about them; chalk "*Train de plaisir pour Berlin*" on the freight-cars that carry them to the frontier. The unhoused burgesses of Rheims whom Gaspard encounters at the inn in Anjou, who tell him what he must do to the Germans when he returns to the front, and then refuse to dine in the same room with a common soldier, would like to blow up "*leur Guillaume et leur Kronprinz*." But something else seems to have been uppermost in the author's mind. Was he not thinking of how the war had made his nation one with itself, had brought citizen and townsman and countryman shoulder to shoulder in common service to the republic, just as out of journalist and mechanic and tradesman and savant Gaspard's regiment composed itself? It is as if there had been revealed to him, as to the wounded and dying soldiers on their way from the front to the Angevin hospital, the undying youthfulness of the "pleasant land of France," and, under the hoods of the nurses, the genius of the French woman. Gaspard is a snail-merchant, we are told. But, after all, what else is the hook-nosed little man, surcharged with energy and wit, terrible of idiom and tender of heart, but the traditional Frenchman, the Gallic Cock of legend? This time it is no Chantecler, disillusioned and consoling himself with the hope of "making the sun rise in human hearts." Gaspard is of the older, the recurrent stock. He comes from out of the heart of the Parisian people, undisciplined, irrepressible, quick at any task he sets himself to accomplish. No one remains indifferent to him. Scarce is the regiment formed before he has begun galvanizing his comrades. He goes as a private, but it is his eternal *blague* that keeps up the spirits of the soldiers, his influence that forms a smoothly functioning complement to the quiet authority of the captain.

Army men know just how much the morale of troops depends on such unofficial leadership; how fortunate the country that produces such men. So has it been once more with France. We quit Gaspard on the Avenue Alexandre III, hobbling along in the tranquil evening light. He has lost a leg; his bunkies, Burette the journalist, Meusse the savant, have been killed at his side. But with him are his mother and his wife. Before him hops another undisciplinable, irrepressible little Gaspard. And, together, they go—"towards the dome of the Invalides."

Such a book, in spite of what a translator who wishes to pass off the Gallic Cock for one of the edible variety of the gender can do to it, will make many friends. But to get the full measure of enjoyment out of it, one must, at the commencement of the war, have feared for the life of France. Only then, in realization that "Gaspard" is testimony of the perennial vigor of the land, will the song that was in the heart of the author while he wrote commence in one's own. There will come to the reader the emotions experienced, the last day of July, 1914, by some Americans bound from Germany for Paris. All day they had been overwhelmed by sight of the German troops. At Frankfurt the guard had said to them "If there's a war, better come back to us!" Outside the tunnel at Mayence there was stationed a corporal's guard, shouldering guns six feet above the ground, each man a simulacrum of the horned Siegfried. All along the line to Metz there were officers and soldiers, arrogant and expectant, eager to step over the border and crush their ancient enemies. The Americans, French partisans, went from depression into gloom. Finally, the train passed the frontier. And there were the French soldiers! They must have been Normans, they were so tall and athletic. For men about to be crushed they were most cheerful and carefree and confident. They were laughing and talking, exchanging sallies with the passengers, rolling each other down the embankment. The Americans at the time did not know it was Gaspard and his comrades. But it did come over them with joyous reassurance that while the spirit that animated those soldiers persisted, France could never die.

P. L. ROSENFELD.

Curiosity Satisfied

Three Sons and a Mother, by Gilbert Cannan. New York: George H. Doran Co. \$1.50 net.

HOW many of us would be really interested if we were set down in Manchester of 1850? There might be some with an aloof desire to know a little more in detail the origins of commercial Liberalism; perhaps early factory organization would attract others. But, however an idea might intrigue us, it is probable that the dull town itself would soon produce intense boredom. It seems as if Mr. Cannan had been tricked by some such antithesis. It would be interesting, he must have imagined, to look into this subsoil of our culture, find out what it did to its people, why it stifled the wayward in them, what roots of the present were strongest in it. But when, as a conscientious novelist, he came to reconstruct it, it repelled him to indifference—an indifference and repulsion which is shared by the readers except in some of the better passages, when he could write of lyrical or canny persons. His interest remained for the most part mere curiosity.

A Scottish family, the Lawries, making its way in the world, is the protagonist. At the top was God—the quaint,

terrible and intimate God of the vivid Scot. Under him reigned the mother, Margaret, a widow. She had broken with her brothers to marry a poor poet of a minister; so now her sons must justify her, they must build the family respectability and become rich. This process seemed as righteous and inevitable to her as if it could have been read out of the Old Testament. Jamie, the eldest, dreamed of being a Napoleon, and began by going to work for his transplanted uncle in Thrigsby—for which we might read Manchester. Thrigsby span and span without caring what it was spinning, except that the cloth might sell. It grew dirtier and more tawdry, richer and poorer. The Lawries moved into it *en masse*. From the first Jamie felt uncomfortable. Not so Tom, or Margaret, or John, or the complacent clans.

"Tom stood dourly looking on at the group of Leslies and Lawries blocking the pathway for the crowd of stove-pipe hatted gentlemen and full-skirted ladies as they came streaming out of church—for all the world," thought Tom, who possessed an inward wit of his own, 'like the animals coming out of the Ark.' Not such a bad simile either, for it was one of those genuine Thrigsby days when air and earth seemed to be saturated with water, dirty water at that, and its pale inhabitants had the wan stare of fish in an aquarium, with something also of their odd alacrity. Mr. Leslie knew almost everybody and had continually to be taking off his hat. 'He's like a pump,' thought Tom."

This is about as close as Mr. Cannan ever comes to Thrigsby. He sees it casually and with a hostile humor. You feel its wanness, its coldness, its stolidity. You understand why Jamie, who tried to be a poet, and an actor, and a dramatic critic, and a lover, got no higher than just missing the managership of the bank and marrying a pretty girl who was disappointed in him only because he missed it. But all this stated in a review means almost as much as if you had read it in the detail of the novel. It is a pity that this sort of thing happened, and the fact that it was allowed to happen means much to us now. Yet we knew it all before.

The true places in the book emerge when Mr. Cannan is interested in the people he likes—Scots, mostly. Jamie is talking to his beloved sister, Mary, on a visit from the Continent.

"'It is a shame,' she said. 'I am having the life you ought to have had.' 'I think not,' said Jamie. 'I'd be using my fists on your philosophers before I'd been with them a week. Instead of that I use my brains on dear, good, foolish living men and that's nigh as stupid.'—'Oh! Jamie,' cried Mary, sitting up in her bed and looking like a lively mischievous little girl. 'If only I could be your wife, I'd make something of you.'—'What would you make of me, wee Mary?'—'The dearest, oddest, kindest man in all the world,' said she.—'You're a funny little sparrow,' he said, stooping over her and kissing her, 'but the English don't want dear, kind men any more. Poor Shelley's dead and they have forgotten Toby Shandy.'—'O! O! O!' cried Mary, 'I wouldn't waste you on the dirty English. I'd have all Edinburgh running after you like the children after the pied piper of Hamelin.'—'Then,' replied Jamie, 'you don't know me, for, if they did, then I'd turn and spit in their faces. I hate a crowd.'"

Mary's trouble is Mr. Cannan's trouble. He hates the dirty English and he wants Jamie in Edinburgh. Therefore, in spite of much solid effort, he can't write of Thrigsby except with a tepid, unrevealing distaste such as any of us might have felt.

G. S.

BOOKS FOR YOUR SUMMER READING

SUMMER IS THE TIME TO CATCH UP WITH THE REALLY GOOD BOOKS YOU HAVE WANTED TO READ, BUT HAVE NOT FOUND TIME FOR. THE TITLES BELOW ARE SELECTED BY THE PUBLISHERS AS THEIR MOST PERMANENT CONTRIBUTIONS

ESSAYS AND LITERARY STUDIES

By STEPHEN LEACOCK

Author of "Literary Lapses," "Sunshine Sketches," etc.

"Mr. Leacock's essays are brilliant, witty and stimulating. His phantasy of an assemblage of Dickens characters discussing the charge that their creator dealt only in 'types' is a delightful bit of fooling with a real and commendable object to be gained. In his last essay the author 'rehabilitates' Charles II."—*New York Sun*.

Cloth, \$1.25 net

PUBLISHERS

JOHN LANE COMPANY

NEW YORK

THE DIPLOMATIC BACKGROUND OF THE WAR 1870-1914

By CHARLES SEYMOUR, Ph.D.

"It is surprising that at the present stage of events a book so sound and historically so mature could be produced. . . . The account of international struggles. . . . 'holds together' so well, is so intelligible and so reasonable, that it seems to exclude prejudice or bitter feeling."—*North American Review*.

Price \$2.00 net, postpaid

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

THE IMPERIAL IMPULSE

By SAMUEL P. ORTH

Brief, vivid character sketches, not of people, but of nations; giving the political, economic, and ethnic backgrounds of five of the cultures now in conflict—Russia, England, France, Belgium, and Germany; making clear much about the warring nations that is hard to understand.

12mo. \$1.20 net

THE CENTURY CO., 353 FOURTH AVE., NEW YORK CITY

ROMAIN ROLLAND'S

JEAN CHRISTOPHE

JEAN CHRISTOPHE IN PARIS

JEAN CHRISTOPHE: JOURNEY'S END

Three novels that are contemporary classics about a great musician in several ways like Wagner. Each of interest by itself.

Each \$1.50 net

HENRY HOLT & Co., 34 W. 33RD STREET, NEW YORK

The LIFE of WILLIAM McKINLEY

By CHARLES S. OLCOTT

The authorized and definitive biography based upon the private letters and the records of close associates. "An accurate comprehensive and sympathetic record."—*George B. Cortelyou*. "A notable contribution to the country's history."—*Cincinnati Times-Star*.

2 vols. Illustrated. \$5.00 net

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, 4 PARK ST., BOSTON

ADDRESSES ON INTERNATIONAL SUBJECTS

By ELIHU ROOT

The first of several volumes of addresses and state papers covering the period of Mr. Root's service as Secretary of War, as Secretary of State, and as Senator of the United States. "The publication (of these volumes) is a notable event in our political history, and it may be said . . . in the history of international politics."—*New York Times*.

8vo. 463 pages. \$2.00 net

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 8 UNIVERSITY HALL, CAMBRIDGE, MASS

The Modern Criminal Science Series. Vol. VIII.

CRIMINALITY AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

By WILLIAM A. BONGER

"This work will promote wide discussion and stimulate thought on the subject for it hits fearlessly at the roots of society and deals interestingly with a subject that concerns all. The deductions are those of a master and are supported by carefully compiled statistics and data."—*Brooklyn Eagle*.

8vo., Cloth, 738 pages; \$5.50 net

LITTLE, BROWN & COMPANY, BOSTON

AN IRISHWOMAN IN CHINA

By MRS. de BURGH DALY

Mrs. Daly is well acquainted with China and her ways. She gives here an interesting and thrilling account of her adventures there. The illustrations from photographs taken by the author are especially noteworthy.

Cloth, 8vo, net \$3.50

FREDERICK A. STOKES Co., 443 FOURTH AVE., NEW YORK CITY

BIRDS AND MAN

By W. H. HUDSON, Author of "Green Mansions," etc.

W. H. Hudson is first a naturalist and then a poet. In the first he defines himself and his point of view. The delightful essays that follow tell of adventures in seeking the birds in their natural setting, and involve wanderings through the beautiful English country. A book that will be thoroughly enjoyed by any one who cares for good English and truth to nature.

\$2.25 net

PUBLISHED BY ALFRED A. KNOPF, NEW YORK

THE MILITARY OBLIGATION OF CITIZENSHIP

By Major-General LEONARD WOOD, U. S. A.

"It is a most valuable contribution to the subject, inspiring in the lesson of patriotism it teaches and strikingly interesting in its delineation of our national psychology toward the question of military service."—*Army and Navy Journal*.

Cloth, 86 pages, 75c. net, by mail, 80c

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, Princeton, N. J.

BODY AND SPIRIT

An Inquiry Into the Subconscious

By JOHN D. QUACKENBOS

This book on the subject of psychotherapy is written by the well-known physician, who proves from numerous cases observed in his own practice his theory of the value of suggestion as a curative force. The author's object is to interpret the true mission of the suggestionist, to make clear what this higher spiritual work really is, and what it is accomplishing.

\$1.50 net

HARPER & BROTHERS

FRANKLIN SQUARE

NEW YORK CITY

A HARVEST OF GERMAN VERSE

Translated and Edited by

MARGARETE MÜNSTERBERG

The greatest of German lyric poems, from the twelfth century to the present day, have been selected and translated into English verse, with the form of the original retained. The volume is truly a "golden treasury" of German verse.

\$1.25 net

D. APPLETON & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK

The Right Kind of History

French Policy and the American Alliance, by Edward S. Corwin, Princeton: Princeton University Press. \$2.00 net.

PROFESSOR CORWIN'S book is in accord with the best traditions of American historical scholarship. It is not a mere digest of documents nor is it that most tragic of failures, a study in bibliography. It is a real interpretation, unpretentious and sincerely aware of its own limitations, of the influence exercised by France on the course of the American Revolution, and an attempt to analyze the motives which led to her intervention. It is a well written book. Its notes show great power of selecting material, and—what is equally important—the ability to make the reader understand the exact character of the issue. It is noteworthy that a large part of the volume was prepared ten years ago as a doctorate thesis. It would be indeed admirable if those who possess doctorate ambitions would be moved to emulate Professor Corwin's noteworthy patience. That from which American historical work is mainly suffering is the anxiety of the immature student to force himself into print with any material and at any cost. If he does not write what is called by courtesy an "original" study then he gives birth to a text-book of English or American history. There is always an ungenial belief that no professor is complete until he has slain his text-book. It is by far higher standards that Professor Corwin's work is to be judged. The qualities which made his "Doctrine of Judicial Review" one of the most valuable of recent works in that field combine to make this present volume without comparison as an analysis of its problem.

What, briefly, Professor Corwin attempts is to shift the perspective of his subject. It has been the habit of American historians to explain the French intervention either as an exercise in the passionate admiration for liberty—a theory to which M. Jusserand has lately lent his powerful assistance—or as an attempt on the part of France to regain the dominion which the brilliant effort of Chatham had wrested from her in the Seven Years' War. Nor is it adequate to interpret it as merely commercial effort. Vergennes himself dismissed American trade, when "thrown open to the avidity of nations" as a "very petty consideration." The point is well made by Professor Corwin that we must discuss the issue in larger terms. It is in the contest of mercantilist policy that the effort of France is to be evaluated. It is to be remembered that statecraft is the very basis of mercantilism and that its nature was discussed in its relation to the controlling doctrine of the balance of power. Studied in that light it becomes very clear that the central reason of French generosity was the belief that the loss of her American colonies would be a deadly blow at England. It was believed by Englishmen themselves that this was the case. The policy does not begin with the Revolutionary War. It is evident in the efforts of D'Argenson no less than those of Choiseul. "The true balance of power," Choiseul very strikingly said, "really resides in commerce and in America." To such an attitude intervention was the natural sequel; and it is very noteworthy that immediately success was apparently in sight the French began to view their engagements in so narrowly restrictive a spirit as to call for the violation by the American Ambassadors of their instructions at the conference of 1782.

It was a dictum of Lord Acton's that France owed more to America than America to France. If we cannot dare to emulate his decision of judgment, let us at any rate realize the danger of expecting generosity from the ancient régime.

Louis XV and his successor were no simple-hearted admirers of democracy. We cannot imagine the cold and bureaucratic Vergennes receiving Franklin with enthusiasm. To set down the intervention in terms of malicious revenge is to misunderstand its atmosphere. Professor Corwin's book is a realistic study. It is supported by the most solid of contemporary documents. Its conclusions must be woven into the texture of any ideal history of America.

H. J. L.

AMERICA AND THE CANAL TITLE

An argument, supported by *citations* from official documents, showing that a Republican Administration violated international law and our treaty with Colombia when it "took the canal zone."

By JOSEPH C. FREEHOFF, Ph. D.

"It is a calm and logical arraignment of Colonel Roosevelt's most boasted achievement, the seizure of the Canal Zone. . . . One who reads this book must admit that our attitude towards our sister republic, Colombia, in 1903, was more that of a highway robber than that of a civilized nation."—*Boston Transcript*.

The proof-based story of that international transgression, which is embodied in this volume, is the most lucid and correct recountal of the Panama incident that has been published.—James T. DuBois, Former U. S. Minister to Colombia.

Convey to Mr. Freehoff the thanks of the Government of Colombia for his masterful work, "America and the Canal Title," and request from him at the same time permission to translate said work into Spanish.—President Concha, Colombia, to Consul in New York.

The right to translate it into Spanish and French has been granted. This is assurance that the book has merit.

12 mo. Cloth. Net, \$1.50

For sale at all booksellers or sent upon receipt of price by

SULLY AND KLEINTEICH 373 FOURTH AVE.
NEW YORK

THE MORALITY OF WOMEN LOVE AND ETHICS

PRICE \$1.00
PRICE \$.50

2 Books by ELLEN KEY
Authorized Editions

RALPH FLETCHER SEYMOUR Publisher
1025 FINE ARTS BUILDING CHICAGO, ILLINOIS



Why Preparedness THE BOOK OF THE HOUR

Do you realize that tremendous changes in the affairs of the whole world are imminent? That the United States must be ready for as yet undreamt of emergencies? That you, as a citizen of the United States, are not a mere onlooker on world happenings today but that your *interests* (no matter who or what you are) are vitally concerned in PREPAREDNESS? Be dependably informed. Read this thrillingly interesting outlook on the European cataclysm and its consequences.

WHO WROTE IT?

Captain Henry J. Reilly; military expert and author; graduate of West point; instructor there; ten years an officer in the U. S. Army; gives his personal observations on the European battle fronts. No man better fitted to write a comprehensive story of the great war and its lessons. Pictures and maps, accurately prepared, enrich and enliven a masterly narrative. Introduction by Major-General Leonard Wood. 424 pages. 8 vo. \$2.00 at bookstores; \$2.20 post-paid from the Publishers.

DAUGHADAY & CO., 610 S. Dearborn St., CHICAGO